This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

MANUAL

OF

Universal Church History.

BY THE

REV. DR. JOHN ALZOG,

Professor of Theology at the University of Freiberg.

TRANSLATED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE NINTH AND LAST GERMAN EDITION,

BY

F. J. PABISCH,

Doctor of Theology, of Canon and of Civil Law, President of the Provincial Seminary of Mount St. Mary's of the West, Cincinnati, O.

AND

Rev. THOS. S. BYRNE,

Professor at Mount St. Mary's Seminary.

In Three Volumes.

WITH CHRONOLIGICAL TABLES AND ECCLESIASTICO-GEOGRAPHICAL MAPS.

VOLUME III.

CINCINNATI, O.

ROBERT CLARKE & CO.

1878.

Hosted by Google

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1878, by
ROBERT CLARKE & CO.,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

Stereotyped by CAMPBELL & Co., Cincinnati.

Hosted by Google

PREFACE.

We take pleasure in congratulating Rev. Doctor Pabisch, President of St. Mary's Seminary, and Rev. Thomas S. Byrne, on the completion of their great work, the translation into English of the Manual of Universal Church History, by Rev. Dr. John Alzog, Professor of Theology in the University of Freiburg, Brisgau, Baden. The "Additions" and Notes appended to this confessedly great work by our American translators give it, in the judgment of Catholic and non-Catholic readers and scholars, a character of originality, and stamp it as worthy of taking rank with the best productions on the important subject of which it treats, and of supplying a want which, we say it with due reverence, our best historians, or biographers, or hagiographers have, for various reasons and circumstances, left unsatisfied.

It has been unwisely said that an historian, in order to be truthful, just, and reliable, should have neither country nor religion, or that he should be entirely free from prejudice. As well might it be exacted, that he should not be a human being. A Catholic is required by his holy faith to be just and truthful in all his dealings with his fellow man. He knows that his religion, the work of God, has no need of the support or advocacy of falsehood, which it spurns and condemns. The inspired writers of the Old and New Testament have set Church Historians the example, which they follow, of stating the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—no suppression, no concealment, no reticence. If we disclaim the guidance of writers of the highest note, when we detect them perverting the facts of history, or seeking to substitute for them their own opinions or fancies, their errors

Hosted by Google

and prejudices, we turn with confidence and joy to writers like Alzog, who, "*nullius adstrictus jurare in verba magistri*," speaks out what he honestly believes to be the truth, in Posen, in Freiburg, and in Rome. We long since read a learned work, in French, called "Préjugés légitimes." We were then, we are now, convinced that its teachings are sound. We are, if we must use the word, "prejudiced" in favor of the heavenly lessons taught us in the Bible and in our Catechism. For the self same reason, we trust the knowledge communicated to us in a good Church History by men who have read and conscientiously pondered on every work on the subject, from the first, the Acts of the Apostles, to those of the Greek and Latin Fathers—our earliest and latest writers—and who have had access to the best libraries at home and abroad, who have, in Rome, in Germany, and elsewhere, dispassionately weighed the criticisms of learned men on the narratives of all shades of opinion and belief, who have spent their lives in discussing the events connected with the Church's eventful history, since the birth of Christ and previously. If the whole people of God, the Jews of old, are—what can be said of no other people—witnesses and custodians of the truth of divine revelation, we can, without fear of error or contradiction, say that the stupendous effects of the mission of the Catholic Church, are as clear and unmistakable as those of Holy Scripture. Neither Genesis nor the Heavens more evidently proclaim the work of God, the glory of God.

In presenting this wondrous tableau of the work of God in the Church, and by the Church, which God founded for this purpose, the translators (and we say, to a considerable extent, the authors) of these most precious volumes—too large, it has been said, for use in Ecclesastical Seminaries, but which can easily be subdivided—have presented to American students a unique work, that is one the like of which we have not seen before in use, or in our libraries.

Hosted by Google

It is not for their own praise, but to inspire readers and students with confidence, that Rev. Dr. Pabisch and Rev. Thos. S. Byrne, who have labored so generously, so strenuously, at this most valuable production, have been induced to publish the unsolicited notices thereof which have been taken by the press in America and Europe, for which they are duly thankful.

To the publishers we can not sufficiently express our obligations for the generous and able manner in which, regardless of expense, they have presented this History to the public.

It is hardly necessary we should suggest that a work of this magnitude has involved proportionable expense. To cover this expense, we need a liberal patronage for the History, especially from the reverend clergy and from serious students generally. The work is not intended for the public at large, but for students and scholars. And yet, we can not forbear from reminding all that Church History is an Encyclopædia. It is intimately connected with the history of the entire human race. As the idea of Bossuet's Universal History originated in the desire of that truly great man to show to the world how God designed that the progress and development of the nations of the earth were to proceed, if not *pari passu*, at least side by side, with the propagation of the Gospel and the Church, it follows that neither is to be an isolated fact—that the providence of God, the divine administration of human governments and events, is to be adored, as it is manifested in both orders; and thus, that on earth, as in Heaven, in the State, as in the Church, God is all in all.

† J. B. PURCELL,
Archbishop of Cincinnati.

MOUNT ST. MARY'S OF THE WEST,
FEAST OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL, A. D. 1878.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

TO THE READER.

AFTER six years of ceaseless labor the translators and editors of Dr. Alzog's Universal Church History have the satisfaction of presenting the work complete to their subscribers and to the general public. They feel confident that they have not only redeemed their plighted faith with their kind patrons, but given them a great deal more than they had first intended to do. Their work is not a mere rendition of the original text, but a homogeneous enlargement, suited to the wants of the civilized world, now headed by the English-speaking community. Whilst the revered German author, the late Dr. Alzog, was followed with scrupulous fidelity throughout the work, and his own amendments down to our own day faithfully embodied in this volume, a due regard to the ninety millions of English-speaking Christians required a fuller and more independent treatment of our own ecclesiastical affairs, and hence the Church History of America, Great Britain, and Ireland, and the history of the Vatican Council, and of Christian Missions, both Catholic and Protestant, had to be rewritten. As in the two preceding volumes, so also in this, synoptical tables of the leading events and of Councils were added to the original.

As to an essential improvement upon the original we point to the *Ecclesiastical Maps*, gratuitously superadded to the Manual of Universal Church History. Ten months of patient labor on the part of the constructor and engraver of the maps were required for their completion. The maps, subordinate one to the other, are not only illustrative of the present manual, but, moreover, supply welcome information to every

Hosted by Google

student of ecclesiastical history, geography, and statistics. The information concerning the hierarchical organization of the *Catholic World* is absolutely complete; the localities of all the higher educational establishments of the Catholic Church in America, and of the universities in Europe, have been carefully pointed out; and the circumscription of all the dioceses of North America has been accurately traced. Want of space, however, precluded the possibility of being equally full in giving similar information concerning other parts of the world. It will be seen that foreign missions, both Catholic and Protestant, have received such attention in these maps as the paramount importance of the subject obviously demands. The latest edition of the *Gerarchia Cattolica* (Rome, 1878); the American Catholic Almanac of 1878; James Neher's Ecclesiastical Geography and Statistics; Dr. Grundemann's General Missionary Atlas; A. K. Johnston's National Atlas of Geography, Black's Modern Atlas, and Gray's Atlas of the United States, besides many other sources of information have been extensively used in the preparation of these hierarchical, hiero-scholastic, and Christian Missionary Maps.

The topography of the "Orthodox" Greek Church is complete for all countries except the Turkish Empire; and even there, seventy-two sees out of ninety-three in Turkey Proper in Europe, and the patriarchates, with the chief metropolitan sees in Turkey in Asia, have been located. The number of bishoprics belonging to each patriarchate has also been given.

Of the Protestant Episcopal sees some are indicated in the maps, and the remainder given in the table at p. 1092.

The Catholic sees whose suppression was occasioned by the Reformation have also been specified.

THE TRANSLATORS.

Hosted by Google

SYNOPTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF THE THIRD VOLUME.

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM THE WESTERN SCHISM BY LUTHER DOWN TO OUR OWN TIMES (1517–1878).

FIRST EPOCH.

From the Rise of Protestantism to the Treaty of Westphalia (1517–1648).

PAGE.

§ 298. Sources—Works by Protestants and Catholics—*General Character of this Period* 1

CHAPTER I. *Religious Movements in Germany and Switzerland.*

§ 299. Luther's Manifest against Indulgences—His First Adversaries 6

300. Negotiation between Rome and Luther—Disputation at Leipsig—*Eck*, *Emser*, *Carlstadt*, and *Melanchthon* 18

301. Affinity of Luther's Religious System to the Code of the Robber Knights and the Principles of Paganism 26

302. Luther's Condemnation—Publication of the Bull of Excommunication 33

303. The Diet of Worms, 1521—Luther at Wartburg 36

304. Death of Leo X.—His Character 43

305. The Diet of Nürnberg, 1522 44

306. Efforts of Melanchthon and Luther to spread the New Teachings 47

307. The Diet of Nürnberg, 1524 50

308. Disorders at Wittenberg, caused by Carlstadt—The Anabaptists and the Peasants' War 52

309. Henry VIII., King of England, and Erasmus oppose Luther—Marriage of Luther 61

310. Organization of the Lutheran Church in Hesse and Saxony 68

311. Diets of Spire (1526, 1529) 71

312. Diet of Augsburg, 1530—Augsburg Confession—Catholic Refutation—Recess of the Diet 75

Hosted by Google

PAGE.

§ 313. *Zwingli and Oecolampadius* 87
314. Zwingli's System 98
315. The Sacramentarian Controversy 101
316. *Progress of Protestantism in Germany* until the Interim of Ratisbon (1541) 109
317. The Anabaptists at Münster—Bigamy of the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse 115
318. Fresh Acts of Violence by Protestants—Renewed attempts to Adjust Religious Difficulties 121
319. Death of Luther—His Public Character 126
320. The Schmalkaldic War—Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555)—Resignation and Death of Charles V 133
321. *Calvin and his Reform at Geneva—Beza* 143
322. Calvin's System 150

CHAPTER II. *Propagation of Protestantism in Europe.*

§ 323. Protestantism in Prussia 156
324. " " Silesia 159
325. " " Poland 164
326. " " Livonia, Courland, Esthonia, Hungary, and Transylvania 171
327. " " Sweden 175
328. " " Denmark, Norway, and Iceland 188
329. " " England 191
330. " " Scotland 228
331. " " Ireland 235
332. " " France 269
333. " " the Netherlands 284
334. General Causes of the Rapid Spread of Protestantism 291

CHAPTER III. *Continuation of the History of Protestantism—Its Internal Dissensions.*

§ 335. General Characteristics of Protestantism 298
336. The Protestant Clergy—Their Rights—Their Relations to the State—*Episcopal, Territorial,* and *Collegiate System* 302
337. Worship and Discipline 305
338. Protestant Exegetics 309
339. Mystics and Visionaries 312
340. Controversies within the Reformed and Lutheran Churches 315
341. Sects among the Protestants 331

CHAPTER IV. *History of the Catholic Church.*

§ 342. Summary 339
343. *The Ecumenical Council of Trent* 340
344. Other Popes of this Epoch 360

Hosted by Google

PAGE.
§ 345a. The Papacy ... 368
345b. The Secular and Regular Clergy—Revival of Synods ... 370
346. The Order of the Jesuits ... 373
347. Labors of the Jesuits ... 381
348. The Other Orders ... 386
349. Foreign Missions ... 401
350. Theological Science in the Catholic Church ... 411
351. New Controversies on Grace—*Baius, Molina, Jansenius* ... 424
352. Art still in the Service of the Church ... 431
353. Religious Life ... 437

CHAPTER V. *Relation of Catholics to Protestants.*

§ 354. Attempts at Reconciliation ... 442
355. The Thirty Years' War ... 447
356. The Peace of Westphalia ... 455

CHAPTER VI. *The Greek Church.*

§ 357. The Greek Church under the Turks ... 461
358. Relations of the Greek Church to the Lutheran, Calvinist, and Catholic Churches ... 463
359. The Graeco-Russian Church under its own Patriarchs ... 468
360. The Monophysites and Nestorians ... 472

SECOND EPOCH.

From the Peace of Westphalia down to Modern Times (1648–1878).

PART FIRST.

From the Peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution (1789).

§ 361. Sources and Works—*Summary* ... 475

CHAPTER I. *History of the Catholic Church.*

§ 362. Popes of the Seventeenth Century ... 478
363. Popes of the Eighteenth Century ... 485
364. The Gallican Church—Gallican Liberties ... 497
365. Jansenism—*Case of Conscience—Quesnel—Schism of Utrecht* ... 500
366. Quietism—*Molinos, Guyon, Fénélon* ... 510
367. Literature of the Gallican Church ... 517
368. Decline of Religious and Theological Science in France—Influence of the Free-thinkers of England ... 522
369. The Catholic Church in Italy and *Spain* ... 531
370. The Catholic Church in Germany ... 536
371. Literary Activity—Unbelief—Superstition in Germany ... 548
372. Political and Religious Disturbances in Poland ... 558

Hosted by Google

PAGE.

§ 373*a*. The Suppression of the Society of Jesus 562
373*b*. Worship and Discipline from the Sixteenth Century 572
374. Spread of Christianity 576

CHAPTER II. *History of Protestantism.*

§ 375. On the Constitution of the Protestant Churches and their Relations to the State—The Collegial System 585
376. Dogma and Theologians 587
377. Abandonment of Symbols as Rules of Dogmatic Belief—Influence of Modern Philosophy and its Consequences 592
378. Biblical Theologians—The False Enlightenment of Neologism—Classical Literature of Germany 598
379. The Herrnhutters 606
380. The Quakers 608
381. The Methodists 610
382. The Swedenborgians or Church of the New Jerusalem 614
383. Protestant Missions 616
384. Relations of Catholics to Protestants 618
385. The Russian Church under the Permanent Synod 622

PART SECOND.

From the French Revolution down to Our Own Day (1789–1878).

§ 386. General Literature—*Importance of Modern Church History* 626

CHAPTER I. *History of the Catholic Church.*

§ 387. The French National Assembly (*La Constituante*), 1789–1791 629
388. Legislative Assembly—National Convention—Directory—Consulate—Theophilanthropists 642
389. The Roman Republic—*Pius VI.*; he dies in exile 650
390. *Pontificate of Pius VII.*—French *Empire* 652
391. Disagreement between the Pope and the Emperor 664
392. Sad Condition of the Church in Germany, Italy, and Spain 675
393. The Restoration 681
394. Rehabilitation of the Pope—Re-establishment of the Jesuits 683
395. Reorganization of the Catholic Church in Sardinia and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies 687
396. The Catholic Church in Germany—Congress of Vienna 688
397. Pontificate of *Leo XII.* and *Pius VIII.* 691
398. Pontificate of Gregory XVI. (1831–1846) 694
399. The Catholic Church in France under the Bourbons 699
400. Continuation — The Catholic Church in France under Louis Philippe 706
401. The Catholic Church in Spain 715
402. The Catholic Church in Portugal 722

Hosted by Google

PAGE.

§ 403. New Birth of the Church in Great Britain and Ireland..... 725
404. The Catholic Church in Belgium and Holland..... 738
405. The Catholic Church in Switzerland..... 744
406. The Catholic Church in Austria..... 752
407. The Catholic Church in Bavaria..... 757
408. The Catholic Church in Prussia..... 762
409. The Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine..... 771
410. The Catholic Church in Russia..... 779

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

411. His Political Activity..... 782
412. His Energy in Ecclesiastical Affairs..... 791
413*a* and *b*. *The Twentieth Ecumenical Council of the Vatican* and its Immediate Consequences..... 802, 815
414. Revival of Religion in different Countries since 1846—In Portugal and Spain..... 829
415. In France..... 834
416. In Belgium and Holland..... 843
417. In Great Britain and Ireland..... 847
418. In Germany and Switzerland..... 863
419. Catholic Literature in Germany since the Opening of the Nineteenth Century..... 885
420. Activity of the Catholics of Germany in the Field of Speculative Theology..... 900
421. Sects in Germany..... 910
422. The Catholic Church in Russia and Poland..... 918
423. The Missions of the Catholic Church..... 921

CHAPTER II. *History of Protestantism.*

SECTION FIRST.

History of Theology and of the Church in Germany.

§ 424. Futile Efforts to Preserve the Symbols of Protestantism..... 965
425. Influence of Modern Philosophy..... 970
426. The Ultimate Results of the Free Interpretation of Holy Scriptures..... 975
427. The Theology of Compromise and Independent Theology..... 978
428. Revival of Lutheranism—Modern Orthodoxy..... 984
429. The More Important Religious Movements in Germany: (*a.*) In Prussia; (*b.*) Outside of Prussia..... 989, 991
430. Religious and Charitable Societies..... 992

SECTION SECOND.

History of Protestantism Outside of Germany.

431. Protestantism in Denmark, Sweden, Holland, France, Great Britain, and America..... 994

Hosted by Google

PAGE.

§ 432. Enumeration of Sects, Ancient and Modern 1003
433. Protestant Missions and Bible Societies 1006
434. Respective Situation of Catholics and Protestants 1015
435. Conclusion 1025

I. Chronological Table of Popes and Emperors 1031
II. Chronological Table of Principal Personages and Events 1033
III. Chronological Table of Councils 1046
IV. General Index 1051
V. Table of Indian Tribes of the U. S. 1091
VI. Table of Protestant Episcopal Sees out of the United Kingdom 1092
VII. Ecclesiastical Maps.

Hosted by Google

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM THE WESTERN SCHISM BY LUTHER DOWN TO OUR OWN TIMES (1517–1878).

FIRST EPOCH.

FROM THE RISE OF PROTESTANTISM TO ITS POLITICAL RECOGNITION BY THE TREATY OF WESTPHALIA (1517–1648).

§ 298. *Sources. Works. General Character of This Period.*

A. POLITICAL SOURCES AND WORKS.—I. *Guicciardini*, see Bibliography heading § 265.—*P. Jovio*, Hist. sui temp. (1498–1513; 1521–27). Flor., 1550 sq., 2 T. f. *Adriani*, Ist. de suoi tempi (1536–74). Flor. 1583 f.; *de Thou*, Hist. sui temp. (1543–1607). Frcf. 1625, 4 T. f., and oftener. Notationes in Thuani historiarum libros, auctore Joh. Gallo J. C. (Jean Machault, S. J.), Ingolstad. 1624, 4to. *Goldast.*, Impp. Rom., Francof. 1607, fol., and Const. impp. Rom. Frcf. 1615, 3 T. f. *Koch*, Collection of the Recesses of the Empire, Frkft. 1747, 4 v. f.

II. *Robertson*, Hist. of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V., London, 1769, 3 T. 4to. This is the most valuable of his works. †*Ign. Schmidt*, Hist. of the Germans, Ulm and Vienna. 1775 sq., Pts. V.–XI. †*Frederic von Buchholz*, Ferdinand I., Vienna, 1832–8, 9 vols. †*Hurter*, Ferdinand II., Schaffh. 1850 sq. *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the End of the Fifteenth Century, Lps. 1832 sq., 7 vols. †*Cesare Cantù*, Vols. IX. and X. †*Jörg*, Germany during the Period of Revolutions, 1522–26, from diplomatic correspondence, Freiburg, 1851. The special histories of the several countries in the collections of *Heeren* and *Ukert* are to be quoted in the proper places.

B. RELIGIOUS SOURCES AND WORKS.—*a. Protestant:* The biographies and works of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and of *Zwinglius* and *Calvin*, together with those of their most important partisans in Germany and Switzerland. (The Lives and select writings of the Founders of the *Reformed* Church, Elberfeld, 1857–63, in 10 vols.; of the *Lutheran* Church, *ibid.*, 1861 sq., 8 vols.) Add to these the following collections: *Löscher*, Complete Acts of the Reformation (1517–19), Lps. 1720 sq., 3 vols. 4to. *Kapp*, Supplements to the important Documents of the Hist. of the Reformation, Lps. 1727 sq., 4 vols. *Strobel*, Miscellanea, Nürnberg, 1778 sq., six numbers, and Literary Essays, 1784 sq., 2 and 5 vols. *Wagenseil*, Essays on the History of the Reformation, Lps. 1829. *Seidemann*, The Times of the Reformation in Saxony, Dresden, 1846 sq., 2 small vols. *Johannsen*, Development of the Spirit of Protestantism, or Collection of Important Documents on the Edict of Worms and the Protestation of Spire, Copenhagen, 1830. *Neudecker*, Documents on the Times of the Reformation,

Hosted by Google

Cassel, 1836, and Authentic Acts, Nürnberg, 1838. †Dr. *Laemmer*, Analecta Romana, or Researches on Ecclesiastical History in Roman Libraries and Archives, Schaffhausen, 1861. The *same*, Monumenta Vaticana hist. eccles. saec. XVI., Friburg. 1861; the *same*, Supplements to the Ch. H. of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Frbg. 1863; the *same*, Meletematum Romanor. Mantissa, Ratisb. 1875. *Döllinger*, Supplements to the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Educational History of the Sixteenth Century, Munich, 1865, 2 vols. *Christian Scheuels's* Letter-book, or Supplements to the Hist. of the Reformation, published by Baron von *Roden* and *Knaacke*, Potsdam, 1867–72, 2 vols. *Spalatini*, Annales Reformationis (to 1543), ed. by Cyprian, Lps. 1768. A new ed. of all his works, by *Chr. G. Neudecker* and *L. Preller*, Jena, 1851 sq. *Sleidanus* (Professor of Jurisprudence at Strasburg, † 1556), Comment. de statu relig. et reip. Carol. V. Caes. Argentorati, 1555, completed in 1556, and continued down to the year 1564. *Londorpius*, Francof. 1619, III. T. 4to, multis annotationibus illustrata a Chr. Car. (*toward the end*), Frcf. 1785, III. T. 8vo. *Hortleder*, Reflections on the Causes of the war waged in Germany against the League of Schmalkald (to 1555), Frankft. 1617 sq., 2 vols. f. *Von der Hardt*, Hist. litt. reform., Frcf. et Lps. 1717 fol. *Frid. Myconii* (Superintendent of Gotha, † 1546) Hist. reformationis (1518–42), published from the manuscript of the author and illustrated in a preface by *E. S. Cyprian*. Another edition appeared at Lps. in 1718. *Seckendorf* († 1692), Comment. hist. et apol. de Lutheranismo, Frcf. et Lps. (1688) 1692, fol. (against the Jesuit, *Maimbourg*). *J. Basnage*, Hist. de la rel. des églises réformées (Rotterd. 1690, 2 vols. 12mo.), La Haye, 1725, 2 vols. 4to. (against *Bossuet*). *Hottinger*, Hist. of the Helvetic Church, Zurich, 1708 sq., 4 vols. 4to. *Ruchat*, Hist. de la réforme de la Suisse, Genève, 1727 sq., 6 vols. 12mo. *Beausobre*, Hist. de la réforme (to 1530), Berlin, 1785, 3 vols. **Planck*, Hist. of the Rise, the Variations, and the Formation of Protestant Dogmatics until the Formula of Concord, Lps. 1791–1800, 6 vols. *Dr. *Lämmer*, Pre-Tridentine Catholic Theology in the Age of the Reformation, Berlin, 1858. *Marheinecke*, Hist. of the Reformation in Germany down to 1535 (1817, 2 vols.), 1831 sq. 4 vols. (Epitome of Seckendorff). **C. A. Menzel* († 1855), Modern Hist. of the Germans, from the Reformation to the Act of the German Confederacy, Breslau, 1826–48, 12 vols. (In the preface to the second, third, and fourth volumes, the author complains of the wild passion of Marheinecke), 2d ed., Breslau, 1854–55, in 6 vols. *Ranke*, Hist. of Germany during the Age of the Reformation, Berlin, 1839, 5 vols., four editions; the last in "Complete Works," Lps. 1867 sq., Vol. I.–VI. (Cf. Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. IV., p. 540–557; p. 654–668,) and Vienna Annuary, 1841, Vols. 93–96. *Villiers*, Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la réforme de Luther, Paris, 1802. *Schröckh*, Ch. H. since the Reformation, Lps. 1804–12, 10 parts (parts 9 and 10 by Tzschirner). (Tr.) *Häuser*, Hist. of the Age of the Reformation, ed. by *Oncken*, Berlin, 1868. *Hagenbach*, Lectures on the Nature and History of the Reformation, Lps. 1834–43, 6 vols. (down to most recent times); fourth revised edition, Lps. 1870–72, of his Hist. of the Church, Vols. III.–VII. The Hist. of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, in vols. VI. and VII., is an English transl. by *J. F. Hurst*, D.D., New York, 1869. (Tr.) *Hagen*, The Literary and Religious Situation of Germany during the Age of the Reformation, Erlangen, 1841 sq., 3 vols. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, principally in Germany, Munich, 1867. *Schenkel*, The Essence of Protestantism, Schaffhausen,

Hosted by Google

1844–51, 3 vols. *Merle d'Aubigné*, Histoire de la Réformation au seizième siècle (1835–1869), or Hist. of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. More than 300,000 copies of the English translation have been sold in Great Britain and America. It is written with the utmost vivacity, is undoubtedly picturesque, and sometimes even eloquent; but the work has been censured by adverse critics as one-sided, pretentious, and bigoted. Archbp. Spalding called him an arch-perverter of history. Among *M. D.'s* other historical productions are—Le Luthéranisme et la Réforme, Paris, 1844; Le Protecteur, ou la République d'Angleterre aux Jours de Cromwell (1848). (Tr.) *Chas. P. Krauth* (D.D., Prof. in the Evang. Lutheran Theological Seminary, etc., in the University of Pennsylvania.) The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, Philadelphia, 1871. (Tr.)

β. Works by Catholics.—*Surius* (Carthusian of Cologne, † 1578), Chronicon ab a. 1500 usque 1566, Colon. 1567, continued to 1573 and often published (against Sleidanus). *Siméon Fontaine*, Histoire catholique de nostre tems touchant l'estat de la religion chrétienne, contre l'histoire de J. Sleidan, Anvers, 1558. *Roveri Pontani* (Carmelite of Brussels) Vera narratio rerum ab a. 1500 usque ad a. 1559, in republica christiana memorabilium, Colon. 1559 f. *Cochlaeus* (Canon of Frankfurt on the Main, Mentz, Vienna, and Breslau, † 1552), Comment. de actis et scriptis Lutheri, Mogunt. 1549. Cf. *M. de Weldige-Cremer*, De Joan. Cochlaei vita et scriptis, Monast. 1865. *Otto* (of Breslau), Cochlaeus as a Humanist and His Colloquy with Luther (Austrian Quarterly of Cath. Theol., year 1866, nro. 1). *Ulenberg* (at first Protestant and student at Wittenberg, then Catholic, † as parish priest at Cologne, 1597), Vitae haeresiarcharum Luth., Melanchth., Majoris, Illyrici, Osiandri. *Ejusdem*, Causae graves et justae, cur Catholicis in communione veteris ejusque veri Christianismi constanter usque ad vitae finem permanendum sit, etc., Colon. 1589. Cf. the article, "Anti-Reformers of the Sixteenth Century," in *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I.; *Raynaldi*, Continuatio annal. Baronii, and the historians of the Council of Trent, *Paolo Sarpi* and *Pallavicini*. **Bossuet*, Hist. des variations des églises protestantes, Paris, 1688, 2 vols. 4to; 1734, 4 vols. (in the new edit. of Bossuet's works, Paris, 1836, Vols. V. and VI., with the defense against Jurieu and Basnage). Eng. transl., Antwerp, 1742, 2 vols.; New York, 1850, 2 vols. (Tr.) *Maimbourg*, S. J., Hist. du Luthéranisme, Paris, 1680, 4 vols. The *same*, Hist. du Calvinisme, Paris, 1682. *Varillas*, Hist. des Révolutions arrivées dans l'Europe en matière de Religion; 2d edit., Amst. 1689–90, 6 vols. **Riffel*, Christian Ch. H. from the great Schism to our own Days, Vol. I., Mentz (1841) 1844 (to the end of the War of the Peasants); Vol. II., 1842 (to the Peace of Religion, 1555); Vol. III. (Zwinglius in Switzerland). †*Boost*, The Reformation of Germany, Ratisbon, 1845. **Döllinger*, The Reformation, its internal Developments and Effects (according to the testimony of Protestants), Ratisbon, 1846 sq., 3 vols.; 2d revised and augm. edit., Ratisbon, 1848. (Tr.) (**E. von Jarcke*), Studies and Sketches of the Hist. of the Reformation, Schaffhausen, 1846. †*Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theol. in Germany, Munich, 1866. Among the Manuals of Ch. H., we mention, especially, **Döllinger*, Vol. II., Pt. II., being a continuation of Hortig, Landshut, 1828, and *Ritter*, 6th ed., Vol. II., down to recent times. †*Palma*, h. e., T. IV., Rom. 1846. Dr. *F. X. Kraus*, Text-book of Modern Ch. H. (being Vol. III. of his entire work), Treves, 1875.

Hosted by Google

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.

This period has its own peculiar characteristics, which impress upon it features essentially different from those of the preceding one. These are:

1. In general, a complete severance of the close alliance formerly existing between Church and State; and, in particular, an irreparable rupture between the Papacy and the Empire, of which there were many and unmistakable indications as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

2. A sundering of the bond of unity by faith, giving rise in the countries of Christian Europe, heretofore *united* and professing but *one* religion, to three distinct religious bodies—viz., Lutheran, Reformed or Calvinistic, and Anglican, not to speak of countless minor sects—all wholly external to and in revolt against the Catholic Church, whose numbers were greatly diminished by their apostasy.

3. Hence, once the exclusive importance attached to faith by the early reformers had been rejected, the steady hold which religious truths had on men's minds was shaken, and the religious view of life and tone of science, so characteristic of the preceding period, were superseded among Protestants by a so-called *Humanism*, and, through the consistent development of the latter, by an infidel, worldly, and anti-Christian spirit.

4. Again, this religious schism alienated *science* from religion; profaned the sanctity of domestic life; inaugurated a spirit of controversy which not unfrequently carried disputants to unseemly excesses; engendered ceaseless strifes; and called forth feelings of mutual distrust and estrangement.[1]

5. Finally, the schism was the cause and occasion of *political revolutions* so violent and far-reaching, that, in many countries, the introduction of Protestantism was accompanied by a change of dynasty, and in Poland and Ireland by a loss of national independence.

Modern, like ancient and mediæval Church History, is

[1] On the influence of the schism on literature, see *Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. XIX., year 1847, in three articles.

Hosted by Google

divided into two epochs—the first embracing the interval between 1517 and 1648, and the second that between the Treaty of Westphalia and our own day. To give a full and spirited exposition of the events of the first epoch, it will be convenient to make the pseudo-ecclesiastical reform of Luther, which was in fact the mainspring of the religious and political commotions that took place in the interval, the *cardinal fact*, to which all others are to be more or less directly referred. Hence, it will be necessary to trace the history of this pseudo-reform in its origin, progress, and development; to watch the course of the hitherto dominant Catholic Church; to observe her policy, movements, counter-movements, and the fresh display of her energies; and, finally, to note the relations of the various sects to each other. The reasons for so arranging the subject-matter of the first epoch of this period that *the history of Protestantism will for the time be brought forward with greater prominence than that of the Catholic Church*, will be obvious from the above considerations. In the second epoch, an order just the reverse of this will be followed.

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER I.

RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND.

A.—To the Formal Separation of Protestants, of which the Confession of Augsburg was the Occasion (1517–1530).

§ 299. *Luther's Manifest against Indulgences.*

Luther's works, in Latin, Vit. 1545 sq., 7 vols. folio; Jena, 1556–58, 4 vols. fol.; in German, Wittenberg, 1539 sq., 12 vols. fol.; Jena, 1555 sq., 8 vols. fol. Moreover, two Supplementary vols. by *Aurifaber*, Eisleben, 1564 and '65. Exclusively German writings of Luther are found in the edition of *Sagittarius*, published at Altenburg 1661–64, 10 vols. Supplementary volume to all former editions (by *Zeidler*), Halle, 1702; Lps. edit., 1729–40, in 22 vols. fol.; the *Halle edition*, by *J. G. Walch*, 1740–50, 24 pts. 4to. (Only the *German translation* of the Latin works is given in the last two editions). Edition in both original languages by *Plochmann* and *Irmischer*, Erlangen, 1826–56, 67 vols. Conf. *Irmischer*, A brief History of the complete edition of Luther's works (Periodical for Protestantism and Church, 1850, nro. 1). *Luther's* letters, circulars, and memoirs, edited by *de Wette*, Berlin, 1825–28, 5 pts. Supplement thereto, by *Dr. Burkhardt*, Lps. 1866. *Melanchthon*, Hist. de vita et actis Lutheri, Vit. 1546; ed. Augusti, Vratisl. 1817. In addition to these works, one may also consult the biographies of Luther, by *Cochlaeus*, *Ulenberg*, and in modern times, *Uckert*, Gotha, 1817, 2 vols.; *Pfizer* (who idolizes his hero), Stuttg. 1836; *Schenkel*, The Reformers (Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin, and Melanchthon), Wiesbaden, 1856. *Jürgens*, Luther from his birth until the controversy on Indulgences, Lps. 1846, 4 vols., to be compared with *Audin*, Hist. de la vie, des écrits et des doctrines de Martin Luther, Paris, 1839, 2 vols.; ed. IIème., Paris, 1841; Engl. ed., Life of Luther, transl. by Bp. J. M. McGill, Philadelphia, 1841, 2 vols.; also by W. B. *Turnbull*, Germ. ed., Augsb. 1843. (It contains many things incorrect and inexact.) "Luther's work and Luther's works," in the "*Catholic*" of A. D. 1827, by *J. von Görres*. Cf. von *Sybel*, Journal of History, New Phenomena of Lutheran Literature, Vol. 27, year 1872.—Tr. adds: The Reformatory Writings of *Dr. Martin Luther*, by Zimmermann; the *Life of Martin Luther*, Related from Original Authorities, with sixteen engravings, by *Moritz Meurer*. Engl. transl. by a Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 8vo., New York, Ludwig & Co. The *Life of Martin Luther*, Gathered from his own Writings, by *M. Michelet;* transl. by *G. H. Smith*, F. G. S., New York. The Table Talk (Tischreden), or *Familiar Discourse* of *Martin Luther;* transl. by *Wm. Hazlitt*, Esq., London. **Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopaed., art. "*Luther*," by *Döllinger*.

To the elements of political strife, which seriously threat-

Hosted by Google

ened the peace of Europe at the close of the last period, religious difficulties at once grave and numerous, and containing the germs of incalculable mischief[1] in the near future, were now added. Everything combined to weaken the great influence formerly exercised by the *Popes* in European affairs, of which it will be sufficient to instance the papal schism, the unhappy events that took place at the Councils of Constance and Basle, or were occasioned by their action, and, finally, the worldly lives and taste for war which characterized some of the chief pastors of the Church. Although the warlike and chivalrous *Emperor Maximilian* had succeeded in establishing (1495) public peace in many of the German states, and had secured its maintenance by the institution of the Imperial Chamber (the supreme court of the German Empire), his authority was nevertheless too much enfeebled to enable him to act energetically and decisively in critical emergencies occurring either within or without his empire. Cities asserted their freedom and grew in wealth and prosperity; the nobility drew out a painful existence in ignorance and poverty; and the bulk of the people, constantly oppressed, were ready at any moment to rise in open rebellion. The cavaliers, warriors by profession and never content but when in the midst of its excitements, felt the restraints of law and order, longed for the return of the days when might was right, and impatiently awaited a favorable opportunity to draw their swords, and deal a decisive and fatal blow against the domination of princes and the authority of priests. War came at last. On the one hand, the call of Charles, grandson of Maximilian (by Philip the Fair) to the throne of Spain (1516), and shortly after (1519) to the imperial crown and succession in Austria, had excited *the jealousy of France* and her young and ambitious king, *Francis I.*, (1515) *against the House of Hapsburg;* and on the other, Austria, Germany, and Hungary in the East were seriously threatened by *the alarming advance of Turkish*

[1] Cf. *Moehler's* Essay on the Situation of the Church in the fifteenth century and at the beginning of the sixteenth (Complete Works, Vol. II.); and *Groene*, Situation of the German Church before the Reformation, in the Tuebing. Quart., year 1862, nro. 1, p. 84–138, who, however, arrives at a somewhat different conclusion.

Hosted by Google

domination. In the midst of these grave religious and political complications, accompanied in France, Spain, and England by the triumph of royalty and the decline of the nobility, and in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, where the aristocracy of the clergy and the nobles was particularly powerful, by important limitations of the royal power and prerogative, it was plain that one of two things would inevitably come about. Either some great man gifted with strength of character and a talent for organization and government, and having the interest of Church and State sincerely at heart, would arise to avert the impending danger, by allaying conflicting passions through the operation of existing authority and the agency of institutions called into being with the special view of meeting the exigencies of the moment; or, in the absence of one possessing these qualifications, the world should be prepared to behold a rash and daring man inconsiderately flinging from him the brand that would surely kindle the long-threatened conflagration, evoke ferocious passions, and lead to bloody conflicts and political revolutions.

The first to come forward to raise his hand against the religious and social fabric, and deal it a blow under which it reeled, was *Martin Luther.*

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, in Saxony, November 10, 1483, of poor but respectable parents. Shortly after Martin's birth, his father quitted Eisleben, and moved to Mansfeld, whose citizens rewarded his many virtues by conferring upon him an office of public trust.

Martin was early taught to read and write, and formed to the practices of Christian virtue. Possessing a fine voice and correct ear, he was received among the choir boys of the school, and, his parents being too poor to defray the expenses of a liberal education, he, as was the custom in Germany, went about singing at the windows of the wealthy to procure a pittance to enable him to prosecute his studies. He was sent, at the age of fourteen, to the Franciscan school at Magdeburg, where he received his tuition free, and was barely able to pay his board with the paltry sums flung to him from the windows under which he sang. After passing a year of this precarious existence, he went to Eisenach, where he was

Hosted by Google

more fortunate. Passing down one of the principal streets of the city, he stopped before a house whose size and elegance bespoke the wealth of the inmates, and began to sing. A lady appeared at the window, and, charmed by the quality of the young scholar's voice and the expression of his singing, threw him some coins, and invited him in. Ascending the stairs, Martin was affectionately received by the lady, and invited to partake of her hospitality. This was Ursula Cotta, who continued a second mother to the young wanderer while he remained in her house. Martin now pursued his studies vigorously under the monks, and had as his professor of grammar, rhetoric, and poetry, the celebrated J. Trebonius, rector of the monastery of Discalced Carmelites. At the age of sixteen, he had mastered the Latin tongue. In 1501, his father, who had become a master miner, and whose circumstances were consequently materially improved, sent him to the University of Erfurt with a view to have him study law. The legal profession, however, does not seem to have been much to Martin's taste; for, instead of law, he ardently applied himself to the study of the dialectics of the Nominalists and to the Latin classics.

In 1505, he took his degree of master of arts and opened a course of lectures on the Physics and Ethics of Aristotle.[1] These studies, however, were wholly inadequate to give peace and quiet to Luther's *restless and religious* mind. Naturally disposed to take an extreme view of everything, and horrified by the sudden death of his young friend Alexis, who was struck dead at his side by lightning, he at once closed the writings of Aristotle, and, without even taking leave of his fellow-students, quitted the University on the night of July 17, and going directly to the Augustinian Convent of Erfurt, "to dedicate himself to God," was kindly received by the monks. His father, ambitious to see his son a learned professor of law and to cut a figure in the world, wrote him an angry letter deprecating his course. During the early part

[1] †*Kampschulte*, The University of Erfurt and its Relation to Humanism and the Reformation, Treves, 1858–62, two pts.; *idem*, De Georgio Wicelio, Bonnae, 1856; de Joanne Croto Robiano, Bonnae, 1862.

Hosted by Google

of his noviciate, he was made to perform the menial offices of the monastery; but from these he was, after a time, relieved, through the intercession of friends, and in 1507, despite the remonstrances of his father and others, made his profession, and took priest's orders. He was so greatly agitated while saying his first Mass, that he would have left off at the Canon and come down from the Altar, had not the prior prevented him. Yet he tells us himself that there was no more pious and faithful priest than he, and, though subject to fits of melancholy, he roused and comforted his troubled spirit by reading passages of Holy Writ pointed out to him by his brethren and superiors. Luther learned that the monks, far from being unfamiliar with the Scriptures, possessed many copies of them in their library, and, instead of preventing him from reading them, encouraged him to make them his chief study.[1] He followed their advice, applying himself specially to the study of the commentaries of *Nicholas de Lyra*. *Dr. John Staupitz*,[2] Provincial of the Augustinians of Meissen and Thuringia, who had directed Luther's attention to the works of *St. Augustine*, was so pleased with his aptitude and proficiency, that he recommended him to Frederic the Wise, Prince-elector of Saxony, who was then casting about for professors for his new University of *Wittenberg*. Here he first (1508) taught dialectics, and having taken his first degree, or baccalaureate, in theology, gave lectures in this branch also. At the earnest request of Dr. Staupitz, but much against his own will, he consented to take upon him the formidable office of preaching the Gospel.

The learning, quick intelligence, and piety of Luther specially commended him to his superiors, and pointed him out as one well fitted to undertake important offices of trust. Hence he, with another brother, was selected to visit Rome in 1510, for the purpose of transacting some business relating to his Order. Coming in view of Rome, he fell on his knees and cried out, "*Hail Rome, Holy City, thrice sanctified by the*

[1] *Luther's* Works, Vol. XXI., p. 21; Meurer, p. 25. (Tr.)

[2] *Joannis Staupitti* opera, quae reperiri potuerunt omnia, ed. *Knaake*, Potisdam. 1867. Cf. also **Pasig* (Superintendent of Schneeberg), John VI., Bp. of Meissen, Lps. 1867.

Hosted by Google

blood of martyrs." His heart glowed with holy fervor as he visited the shrines and sanctuaries of the Eternal City, and "he almost regretted that his parents were not already dead that he might, by saying Masses, reciting prayers, and doing good works, deliver their souls from purgatory." He was, however, particularly scandalized *on hearing* that many of the Roman ecclesiastics were infected with a spirit of unbelief.

On his return to Germany, he was declared licentiate of Sacred Theology on the feast of St. Luke, October 18, 1512, and the day following, during the ringing of the great bell of All Saints' Church, which was prescribed by the statutes of the University, invested with the insignia of the doctorate. Speaking of this event, Luther himself says: "I was obliged to take the degree of doctor, and *to promise under oath* that I would preach the Holy Scriptures, which are very dear to me, *faithfully and without adulteration.*"[1] The better to fit himself to become an efficient professor of Holy Scripture, or, as some say, from motives of vanity, he was at special pains to acquire a thorough knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, so necessary as aids to gain the true sense of the *Psalter* and Epistles of St. Paul to the *Romans* and the *Galatians*. Even at this early age he had already embraced, in a confused way, the doctrine that good works are wholly worthless, and that *faith alone* is all sufficient for salvation.

It was at this time that indulgences were published in Germany by the authority of the munificent and splendid *Leo X.*, the proceeds of which were to be applied to the building of *St. Peter's Basilica* in Rome, commenced by Julius II.[2] The office of publishing[3] the indulgences was given to the Elector *Albert*, a prince of the House of Brandenburg, Archbishop of *Mentz* and Magdeburg, and administrator of the diocese of Halberstadt, who was as extravagant and as fond of magnificent displays as Leo himself.

[1] *Luther's* Works, XX., p. 336; *Melanch.*, in vita, p. 13; *Meurer*, p. 33.

[2] The bull in *von der Hardt*, l. c., T. IV., p. 4.

[3] †*Hennes*, Albert of Brandenburg, Archbp. of Mentz and Magdeburg, Mentz, 1858. *Jac. May*, Albert II., Elector, Cardinal, and Archbishop, together with eighty-two documents and appendices, Munich, 1866.

Hosted by Google

Albert selected the Dominican *Tetzel of Leipsic* to preach the indulgences to the people of his dioceses. A ripe scholar and a fine popular speaker, Tetzel proclaimed the efficacy of indulgences in language at once ardent and energetic,[1] which, while at times sufficiently offensive to call forth expressions of hostility against both the man and his mission, was by no means so intemperate or extravagant as his enemies would have us believe.

As the civil and ecclesiastical authorities had but recently enacted measures restricting the sale of indulgences, the recent publication of them gave no little offense.[2] In the year 1500, the electoral princes entered a protest against their publication, and enacted in 1510 that sums of money arising from this source should not be sent out of the country. The Emperor Maximilian was at special pains to see that the latter provision was faithfully executed. *John, Bishop of Meissen*, had also issued a prohibition, cautioning any one in his diocese against receiving the preachers of indulgences; and a similar prohibition had been published in the diocese of Con-

[1] Against the boundless misrepresentations and unscrupulous fabrications in the early biographies of Tetzel, put into circulation by such men as *Hecht*, Vitemb. 1717; *Vogel*, Lps. 1717 and 1727, and *Hoffmann*, 1844, cf. *Correspondence of two Catholics on the Controversy between Tetzel and Luther on Indulgences, Frankfort on the Main, 1817; †*Groene*, Tetzel and Luther, or a Biography and Vindication of Dr. Tetzel, Preacher of Indulgences, 2d ed., Soest, 1860. Moreover, Tetzel in his Instruction to Parish Priests (Oct. 31, 1517) expressly prescribed that "whosoever, *having confessed* and *being penitent* (*confessus et contritus*), shall bring alms (*eleemosynam*, i. e. for this special purpose), shall obtain remission of temporal and canonical punishment." See *Loescher* l. c., I., 414, and the ordinary formula of absolution which the Lutheran Seckendorf himself (Hist. Lutheranismi, lib. II., sect. 6, gives in the following terms: "Misereatur tui Dominus noster *Jesus Christus*, per merita suae sanctissimae passionis te absolvat et ego auctoritate ejusdem et beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum et sanctissimi domini nostri papae mihi concessa et in hac parte mihi commissa te absolvo: primo ab omnibus censuris a te quomodolibet incursis, deinde ab omnibus peccatis, delictis et excessibus — — etiam sedi Apostolicae reservatis, in *quantum* claves sanctae matris ecclesiae se extendunt, remittendo tibi per plenariam indulgentiam omnem poenam in *purgatorio* pro praemissis debitam, et restituo te sanctis sacramentis ecclesiae et unitati fidelium ac innocentiae et puritati, in qua eras, quando baptizatus fuisti, etc. In nomine P., F., et Spiritus Scti. Amen.

[2] See Vol. II., p. 869, note 2.

Hosted by Google

stance. Luther was, therefore, not the first to protest against the flagrant abuses incident to putting indulgences on sale; but had he been, no blame could have attached to him, for he would have been only exercising a right which he had in virtue of his offices of preacher, confessor, and doctor of theology. So also, when, by the advice of his friends, he affixed his famous ninety-five propositions to the doors of the church attached to the castle of Wittenberg, on the Vigil of All Saints (October 31, 1517), he did no more than what was sanctioned by the usage of that age. It would seem that he might claim the greater right to do so, inasmuch as he openly proclaimed the doctrine of indulgences, saying in his seventy-first proposition: "Whosoever speaks against the truths of papal indulgences, let him be anathema;" and protested that it was not his wish or purpose to say aught against Holy Writ, or the teachings of the Popes and the Fathers of the Church. No fault, therefore, could be found with him for having denounced whatever was really extravagant and excessive in the preaching of indulgences, and for having called for some authoritative settlement of the question, of which, as he afterward confessed, "he knew no more at that time than those who came to inquire of him."[1] That he was sadly in need of some elementary instruction on the nature of indulgences, their conditions and effects, is painfully evident from the grotesque character and intemperate language of many of his propositions.[2] Luther's fundamental principle, more fully and distinctly drawn out as years went on—viz., that "*God alone, independently of human exertion, is all in all*

[1] In *Loescher*, Complete Acts of the Reformation, Pt. I., p. 367 sq., and in the editions of Luther's Works, e. g. that of Jena, Pt. I., Altenburg, Vol. I.; that of *Walch*, Vol. XVIII., p. 255 sq. The above passage was transcribed literally by *Ranke* from the *original* text preserved in the royal library of Berlin, and published in his Complete Works, Vol. VI., p. 80–85.

[2] In his twenty-ninth proposition, Luther asks: "Who knows if every soul would desire to be delivered from purgatory?" Again, in his eighty-second: "Why does not the Pope, since he may open heaven to so many for a few wretched florins, of his sacred charity empty purgatory of the suffering souls confined there?" Moreover, while some of the propositions affirm that indulgences are useless and harmful, others affirm that they should not be made light of. Among the most objectionable propositions are the thirty-sixth, according to which whosoever is truly *sorry* for his sins receives remission

Hosted by Google

in the affair of man's salvation"—was substantially contained, and but thinly disguised, in these propositions. Failing to detect this latent poison, many loudly applauded his course, and among them the Bishop of Würzburg,[1] who, in a letter to the Elector, *Frederic the Wise*, begged that prince to take Luther under his protection, and shield him from his enemies. Luther wrote to the Archbishop of Mentz, praying him to mark out the proper course to be followed in the affair of indulgences, that their publication might be made in a manner at once becoming and lawful; but in failing to wait an answer, he indicated a disposition to subvert established order, and set law at defiance. On the other hand, the Archbishop can not be held entirely blameless; for, in writing to Luther after the latter had begun to make a stir in the world, he said:[2] "As yet I have not found time to read your writings, or even to glance through them; I leave the judgment on the questions raised in them *to my superiors in rank and dignity.* I have learned, however, with sincere sorrow and no little displeasure, that grave doctors engage in heated controversy concerning such trivial questions as the *Pope's power;* whether he holds his office of Head of the Church by Divine or human authority; whether or no man enjoys free will; and similar points, concerning which no earnest Christian gives himself very much concern." He had, however, submitted the affair to the arbitration of the theological faculty of Leipsig.[3]

The great applause that greeted the appearance of Luther's propositions revealed the intense indignation everywhere

of them and the punishment due to them; the fifth and twentieth, which declare that the Pope can remit only such penalties as are imposed by himself or the Church, but not those imposed by God; the eighth, tenth, and thirtieth, which restrict canonical penalties to the living, thereby exempting the dead from such hardship, and denying their need of indulgences; and the fifty-eighth, which denies that the treasures of the Church, whence indulgences are drawn, are the merits of Christ and his Saints. Cf. the scathing criticism of the propositions in *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 32 sq.; 2d ed., p. 65 sq.

[1] *Surius*, ad an. 1517, declares: "In ipsis hujus tragoediae initiis visus est Lutherus etiam plerisque viris gravibus et eruditis non pessimo zelo moveri planeque nihil spectare aliud, quam ecclesiae reformationem." Cf. *Erasm.*, epp. lib. XVIII., p. 736.

[2] Luther's Works, apud *Walch*, Pt. XV., p. 1640.

[3] See *Wiedemann*, John Eck, p. 85.

Hosted by Google

evoked by the abuse of indulgences. Within the short interval of two months, they were known in almost every country of Europe. Many written replies to them were at once put forth, the first being the *Three Days Labor* (*Tridui labor*) of the Roman Dominican, *Sylvester Prierias* (*Magister Sacri Palatii*), in which the claims advanced in behalf of the papal power[1] were in a measure excessive. *Tetzel* followed with a refutation of Luther, entitled "*On Indulgences and Grace*," written in German, and published simultaneously with the theses of the Reformer. In a disputation undertaken by the same writer at the University of Frankfurt on the Oder,[2] on the occasion of his taking the degree of licentiate in theology, and under the presidency of the Dominican monk, *Conrad Koch*, better known as *Conrad Wimpina*, he defended one hundred and six propositions, controverting the errors of Luther with such marked ability as to demonstrate beyond all doubt that he thoroughly understood the Catholic teaching on indulgences, was an excellent theologian, and possessed a well trained and cultivated mind. The burden of these propositions was to show that confession and *satisfaction* (*confessio et satisfactio*) are conditions absolutely necessary to the full remission of sins in the sacrament of penance. *Indulgences*, by which the *vindictive* canonical punishments due to sin are remitted, have to do with satisfaction only, and have no connection with *medicinal* penitence, or remedies for keeping the passions in check, which must be applied by the penitent himself.[3]

Finally, as early as January 20, 1518, Tetzel was again at the University of Frankfurt, on the occasion of taking his

[1] Dialogus in praesumtuosas Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papae (1517), apud *Loescher*, Pt. II., p. 12 sq.

[2] *†*Mittermüller*, Conrad Wimpina, in the Periodical "*The Catholic*," year 1869, Vol. I., p. 641–681; Vol. II., p. 129–165. *Wimpina*, a native of Buchen, and buried in the Franconian Benedictine monastery of *Amorbach*, possessed an almost cyclopaedical knowledge of the current learning of his age, and could, when occasion demanded, turn it to excellent account in debate.

[3] *Liebermann*, Institut. theolog., ed. V., T. V., p. 195: "Id etiam observandum est, quod poenitentiae injungantur non tantum in *vindictam peccati*, sed etiam tanquam *remedia* ad coërcendas cupiditates et curandam animi infirmitatem ex peccatis contractam. Sed *ab hac medicinali poenitentia non eximunt indulgentiae*."

Hosted by Google

degree of doctorate in theology,[1] defending fifty propositions in support of *papal power*.

Among the adversaries of Luther was *Dr. John Eck*, Vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. During his stay at the Universities of Heidelberg, Tübingen, Cologne, and Freiburg, he had stored away vast treasures of philosophical and theological learning, which his rugged constitution, his vigorous, acute and versatile intellect enabled him to turn to the best practical account.[2] At the request of the Bishop of *Eichstädt*, where he held a canonry, he sent to the former a copy of Luther's theses, with the objectionable propositions marked with obelisks,[3] and refuted in marginal notes. This communication, which was supposed to be of a private character, was published in the beginning of Lent, 1518, without previous knowledge on the part of its author, and against his will. Four years later (1522), *Hochstraten*, a Dominican of Cologne, to whom a contest with *Reuchlin* had given some notoriety, also entered the lists against Luther,[4] whom he combated in several works, particularly after the year 1526. Hochstraten and his colleagues were indiscreet in their mode of attack, for, instead of confining themselves to the question at issue, they went aside from their main purpose to take a fling at the Humanists, whom they charged with being at the bottom of all the trouble, singling out *Erasmus* for special animadversion.[5] Such irrelevant advocacy of their cause

[1] Both the theses of *Luther* and the counter-theses of *Tetzel*, apud *Loscher*, l. c., Pt. I., p. 484 sq.; 504 sq. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 36 sq.; 2d ed., p. 71 sq.

[2] Luther had previously borne him witness, that he was an "insignis vereque ingeniosae eruditionis et eruditi ingenii homo" (*de Wette*, Luther's Letters, Vol. I., p. 59). †* *Wiedemann*, Dr. John Eck, Professor in the University of Ingolstadt, Vienna, 1865. Cf. also †**Meuser*, in the *Catholic* Journal of Science and Art, Year III., Cologne, 1846.

[3] Apud *Loescher*, Pt. II., p. 64 sq.

[4] Cum divo Augustino colloquia contra enormes atque perversos Martini Lutheri errores, Colon. 1522. On all the Catholic adversaries of Luther, cf. Dr. *Lämmer*, The Pre-Tridentine Catholic Theology of the Age of the Reformation, Berlin, 1858, p. 1–17.

[5] "*Erasmus*," they said, "laid the egg, and Luther hatched it. The heresy is wholly the work of Greek scholars and polished rhetoricians." Erasmus at first contented himself with an apologetic defense. He wrote to *Hochstraten:* "Haec studia non obscurant theologicam dignitatem, sed illustrant, non oppugnant, sed

Hosted by Google

roused and embittered their adversaries, and harmed only themselves and the great truths they were upholding.[1]

Luther threw himself with all his wonted energy and vehemence into the thick of the fight, and in an incredibly short time had written replies to all his assailants. His reply, entitled the *Asterisks*[2] (*Asterisci*), to the *Obelisks* (*Obelisci*) of Eck, abounds in intemperate invective and unseemly abuse,[3] is frequently *contradictory* in its assertions, and is singularly *subversive of the faith of the Church.* Luther had some time previously, in a discussion which took place in the Augustinian Convent of Heidelberg (April, 1518), avowed the anti-

famulantur" (*v. d. Hardt*, Hist. lit. reformationis II., 13.) But he subsequently maligned the inquisitors. He said: "Olim haereticus habebatur, qui dissentiebat ab evangeliis, ab articulis fidei, aut his, quae cum his parem obtinent auctoritatem; — nunc quidquid non placet, quidquid non intelligunt, haeresis est. Graece scire haeresis est, expolite loqui haeresis est, quidquid ipsi non faciunt, haeresis est." Epp. lib. XII., p. 403.

[1] Erasmus, quoted by Seckendorf, says apropos of the method of Hochstraten: "Nulla res magis conciliavit omnium favorem Luthero," and of Prierias: "Scripsit Prierias . . . sed ita tamen ut causam indulgentiarum fecerit deteriorem."

[2] Both are given in *Löscher*, Vol. II., p. 62 sq., and 333 sq.; Vol. III., p. 660 sq. *Lutheri* Opp. Latin., Jenae, T. I.

[3] Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., 2d ed., p. 73 sq. Speaking of *Sylvester Prierias*, ex gr., he says: "His pamphlet is the incoherent and furious raving of the very Devil, whose tool Prierias is. It is replete, from beginning to end, with abominable and horrible blasphemies, and I make no doubt that its libelous utterances issued from the mouth of Satan, in the very center of hell. . . . Should the Pope and the Cardinals refuse to impose silence on this impudent and infernal blasphemer, I shall break with the Church of Rome, and brand her, the Pope, and the Cardinals as the abomination of desolation. . . . Away with thee, thou infamous, accursed, and blasphemous Rome, the anger of God is at length come upon thee. . . . Since we hang thieves, put murderers to the sword, and consign heretics to the flames, why do we not rather pursue with every manner of weapon these pestiferous teachers of perdition, the Pope, the Cardinals, and the Bishops, and the whole horde of the Roman Sodom, . . . and wash our hands in their blood? Nor is this their adequate punishment . . . they must suffer eternally in hell." These fragments will give an idea of Luther's method of meeting his opponents. *Ranke*, speaking of this literary tilt, says: "However contemptible and easy of refutation the pamphlet of Prierias may have seemed to Luther, *he nevertheless still kept a check upon his speech, biding his time*, not wishing to draw upon himself the enmity of the Curia." Germ. Hist. of the Age of the Reformation, Vol. I., p. 320; Complete Works, Vol. I., p. 213.

Hosted by Google

Catholic propositions which he afterward maintained,[1] and succeeded in gaining Bucer over to his cause. Dr. Andrew Bodenstein, who took the name of *Carlstadt* from his birthplace,[2] declared in his favor at Wittenberg.

The various polemical writings which the occasion called forth, fixed public attention upon the principles of *Christian anthropology*, which, as history proves, may lead to the gravest errors when approached and discussed in any other than a calm and reverential frame of mind.

§ 300. *Negotiation between Rome and Luther—Disputation at Leipsig—Eck, Emser, and Melanchthon.*

Leo X., learning the condition of affairs in Germany, appointed temporarily the learned Venetian, *Gabriel*, the then pro-magister of the Augustinian Hermits, to the vacant office of generalship of the Order (1518). The Pope, led astray by the belief that the whole trouble was no more than what *Cochlaeus*[3] said it was—a rivalry between two religious Orders and a quarrel among a few monks—instructed Gabriel, acting in his official capacity of General of the Order, to remind Luther of his vow of obedience, and in virtue of it to lay upon him the obligation of keeping silence. He was further instructed to do all he could to have the Elector, Frederic the Wise, set his face against Luther, and oppose his designs. The Emperor *Maximilian*, more penetrating and far-seeing than the Pope, called attention, in words of weighty import, to the dangers and gravity of the threatening struggle. "In a little time," he foretold, "private opinion and the folly of

[1] Luther's Works in *Walch*, Pt. XVIII., pp. 66 sq.

[2] Previously to the appearance of Luther's *Asterisci*, Carlstadt had written the *Apologeticae Conclusiones*, embracing one hundred and seventy propositions. He also wrote, in answer to Eck's apology of the *Obelisci*, the *Defensio adv. Jo. Eckii monomachiam*, in *Löscher*, Pt. II.

[3] Cf. the Defense of Cochlaeus by *Lessing*, but in a small matter only (Complete Works, edited by *Lachmann*, Berlin, 1838, sq., Vol. IV., p. 87–101). *Otto*, Cochlaeus as a Humanist. See also the defense of Pope Leo against *Bandello's* report, that the Pope had at first viewed this cause as a trifling matter, in the *Breslau Review* of Catholic Theology, ed. by *Ritter*, 1832, nros. I. and II.

Hosted by Google

man will be set up in place of the truths of tradition, and the principles underlying the scheme of salvation."[1]

The theses and their defense sent by Luther to Pope Leo X.,[2] accompanied with a letter humbly begging the favor of an investigation, and expressing his pacific *intentions* and his readiness to make an unconditional surrender of his own will to that of his superiors,[3] are the first act in a long drama of hypocritical professions. At the close of this letter, he said: "Hence, Most Holy Father, *I cast myself at thy feet*, with all that I have and am. Give life, or take it; call, recall, approve, reprove; *your voice is that of Christ, who presides and speaks in you.*" To Staupitz, he wrote in the same tenor.[4]

Leo appointed a court to try the case, and cited (August 7, 1518) Luther to appear at Rome within sixty days and answer the charges against him. The Elector Frederic interposed his good offices, and at his request Pope Leo consented that Luther, instead of journeying to Rome, should come before the imperial diet of Augsburg, and have a conference with the Papal Legate, Cardinal *Cajetan*, one of the most learned theologians of his age. In the early days of October, 1518, Luther, accompanied by some friends, entered Augsburg, and, fortified with a safe conduct from the Emperor Maximilian and the municipal authorities, presented himself before the Cardinal, who received him kindly, and was disposed to treat him with all possible tenderness. The Legate, having instructions to demand an unconditional retraction, refused to engage in controversy with Luther, who, claiming that he had said nothing contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to the teaching of the Church, the decrees of Popes, and the dictates of right reason,[5] was anxious to enter into a discussion for the purpose of defending his statement on Biblical authority. He nevertheless consented to subscribe to the following declaration: "I, Martin Luther, of the Order of St. Augustine, do

[1] *Raynaldus* ad an. 1518, nro. 90.

[2] Resolutiones disput. de virt. indulgg. (*Löscher*, Vol. II., p. 183 sq.) (Tr.)

[3] *De Wette*, Vol. 1, p. 119. (Tr.)

[4] In *Löscher*, Pt. II., p. 176; and *Meurer*, p. 68. (Tr.)

[5] *Luther's* German Works, Jena ed., Pt. 1., fol. 107–136.

Hosted by Google

reverence and obey the Roman Church in every word and deed, whether in time past, present, or future; and should I have said anything contrary to this profession or in a different sense, I desire that such speech shall be regarded as if never spoken."[1] Apprehensive of arrest and imprisonment, he, on the 20th of October, stealthily escaped from the city, and, liking himself to Isaias and St. Paul, "*appealed from the Pope ill informed to the Pope better instructed*" (*a papa male informato ad papam melius informandum*).

That no one "might have a pretext to plead ignorance of the *true teaching of the Roman Church on indulgences*,"[2] Leo, in a bull issued November 9, 1518, and beginning *Cum postquam*, gave the fullest instruction on the doctrine, and threatened such as should gainsay it with excommunication *latae sententiae*. About the same time, the Pope sent the accomplished Saxon, *Charles of Militz*, to Germany, for the twofold purpose of decorating the Elector Frederic with the golden rose and the securing him in the interest of the Holy See; and of restraining Luther by peaceful measures until such time as the German bishops should have put an end to the quarrel. The Apostolic nuncio while traveling through Germany heard much complaint of the evil effects of Tetzel's preaching, and in consequence sharply rebuked the Dominican for indiscreet zeal. Tetzel took the reprimand so much

[1] *Luther's* Works, Altenburg ed., Pt. I., p. 132.

[2] In *Löscher*, Vol. II., p. 493 sq. *Walch's* ed. of Luther's Works, Pt. XV., p. 756 sq. In this Bull, it is said: "Romanum Pontificem — potestate clavium, quarum est aperire tollendo illius in Christi fidelibus impedimenta, culpam scil. et poenam pro actualibus peccatis debitam, culpam quidem mediante sacramento poenitentiae, poenam vero temporalem pro actualibus peccatis secundum divinam justitiam debitam mediante ecclesiastica indulgentia, posse pro rationalibus causis concedere eisdem Christi fidelibus, — sive in hac vita sint, sive in purgatorio, indulgentias ex superabundantia meritorum Jesu Christi et Sanctorum, ac tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis — thesaurum meritorum Jesu Christi et Sanctorum dispensare, per modum absolutionis indulgentiam ipsam conferre, vel per modum suffragii illam transferre consuevisse. Ac propterea omnes tam vivos quam defunctos, qui veracitur omnes indulgentias hujusmodi consecuti fuerint, a tanta temporali poena secundum divinam justitiam pro peccatis suis actualibus debita liberari, quanta concessae et acquisitae indulgentiae aequivalet." This authoritative instruction perfectly agrees with the doctrines of the Scholastics, given above, pp. 798, 799; notes 2, 3; 1, 2.

Hosted by Google

to heart that he withdrew to a monastery, fell sick, and died, it is said, of grief, July 14, 1519. Miltitz was far more considerate in his treatment of his Saxon countryman, the author of the new teaching, and was deluded into the belief that his mission had been successful. The two had an *interview at Altenburg* (January 5, 1519), and Luther agreed to leave off preaching and live quietly if his adversaries would do likewise; to induce the people to continue obedient to the Holy See; to instruct them by letter in the orthodox sense on the veneration of the Saints, on indulgences, purgatory, the Commandments of God, and the authority of the Pope; and, finally, to write to his Holiness in the spirit of a docile child. In a letter dated March 3, 1519, Luther wrote to the Pope as follows: "I have been unnecessarily, excessively, and abusively severe in my treatment of those empty babblers. I had only one end in view, viz: to prevent *Our Mother, the Roman Church*, from being soiled by the filth of another's avarice; and the faithful from being led into error, and learning to set indulgences before charity. Now, Most Holy Father, I protest before God and His creatures that *it has never been my purpose, nor is it now*, to do aught that might tend to weaken or overthrow the authority of the Roman Church or that of your Holiness; nay, more, I confess that the power of this Church is above all things; *that nothing in Heaven or on earth is to be set before it*, Jesus alone the Lord of all excepted." That Luther was playing the part of a contemptible hypocrite, and did not mean a word of what he wrote to the Pope, is evident from a private letter written to his friend Spalatinus just nine days later (March 12).[1] "I whisper it to you," he writes, "in sooth I know not whether the Pope is Antichrist or his apostle."

The opponents of Luther, and notably *Dr. Eck*, without fully appreciating the consequences of their step, brought on a public discussion previously to the meeting of the German bishops in conference. Some who dreaded the agitation which a discussion of this character would certainly occasion, had their fears set at rest by the splendid reputation enjoyed by

[1] *De Wette*, Tom. I., p. 239. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Eck[1] for ability and learning, and looked forward to a complete triumph. After the manner of the age, the subject-matter to be discussed was thrown into the form of *theses*.[2] The parties to the disputation, which took place in the hall of the Castle of Pleissenburg, at *Leipsig*, in the presence of *Duke George* of Saxony and a highly cultivated audience, and continued for two weeks together, were, on the one hand, Luther and Carlstadt, assisted by the professors of the University of Wittenberg, and on the other Eck and the professors of the Universities of Cologne, Louvain, and Leipsig. The chief propositions discussed were the doctrine of *the condition of man after the fall; of free will and grace; of penance and indulgences;* and of *the primacy of the Church of Rome.* Carlstadt,[3] who had been challenged by Eck, spoke first, maintaining that man of himself is incapable of doing any good work, and that even when in the state of grace his works are wholly destitute of merit.[4] This champion, who had placed the doctor's cap on Luther's head, suffered an ignominious defeat, and after a week's discussion was forced to yield his place to his disciple.[5]

The question of the primacy of the Pope came next under

[1] *Eccii* Epp. Ep. de rat. studior. suor. Ingol. 154, 4to. (*Strobel*, Misc. H. III., p. 95 sq.) *F. Kotgermund*, Erneu. Andenken, Vol. I., p. 251 sq. (Tr.)

[2] Among the most remarkable of these are the following:

I. Man sins daily, and also daily repents, according to the precept of Our Lord: Do penance. None but a just man (Eck) is exempt from this rule, he having no need of penance.

II. To deny that *man sins in doing good*, or that every sin is of its nature mortal, or, if *venial*, so only by the mercy of God, is all one with discarding Paul and Christ.

VII. To assert that *free will* is the arbiter of good or evil actions, or to deny that justification depends *on faith alone*, is silly nonsense.

XI. To affirm that indulgences are beneficial to Christians, or that they do not imply rather *an absence of good works*, is madness.

Carlstadt asserted in his VI. and VIII. theses that daily venial sins, like mortal, work eternal damnation.

[3] His real name was Andrew of Bodenstein; he took that of Carlstadt from his birthplace, in Franconia. Using the initials of these three words, Melanchthon called him the bad A B C.

[4] *A. G. Diekhoff*, de Carolost. Luth. de servo arbitrio doctrinae defensore, Gott. 1850. (Tr.)

[5] Life of M. Luther, by *Audin*, Phil. 1841, p. 97; London, 1854, Vol. I., p. 182.

Hosted by Google

discussion, and Luther, in replying to Eck's argument for its *divine* origin, said that it rested only on human authority, and that of the passage from St. Matthew xvi. 18, the words, "Thou art Peter," were addressed to the Apostle; and those immediately following—viz: "And upon this *rock* I will build My Church"—applied to Christ. In the matter of jurisdiction, he went on to explain, the Pope has no advantage over the Archbishop of Magdeburg or the Bishop of Paris, and whatever supremacy he may enjoy is derived entirely from the sovereign will of the people. He is indeed, he added, the head of the Apostolic College, and has a *primacy of honor, but not of jurisdiction.* Eck's superiority over his adversaries in knowledge, dialectical skill, and readiness and felicity of speech, secured him a brilliant triumph, and elicited the hearty applause of his hearers.[1]

In the course of the discussion, Luther had explicitly maintained that *faith alone*, independently of good works, suffices for salvation; and when confronted with conflicting passages from the Epistle of St. *James*, called in question the authenticity of this Epistle; denied human *free will*, the *primacy* of the Pope, and the *inerrancy* of Ecumenical Councils. The opinions advanced and advocated by him so nearly resembled the Hussite propositions branded as heretical by the Council of Constance, that the Duke of Saxony, startled by their boldness, hastily put an end to the discussion, remarking, "*Here indeed is a fruitful source of danger.*"[2]

[1] *Lutheri* ep. ad Spalat.: "Interim tamen ille placet, triumphat et regnat: sed donec ediderimus nos nostra. Nam quia male disputatum est, edam resolutiones denuo. — Lipsienses sane nos neque salutarunt neque visitarunt ac veluti hostes invisissimos habuerunt, illum comitabantur, adhaerebant, convivabantur, invitabant, denique tunica donaverunt et schamlotum addiderunt, cum ipso spaciatum equitaverunt, breviter, quidquid potuerunt, in nostram injuriam tentaverunt." Acta colloq. Lips. (between Eck, Melanchthon, Cellarius, and Carlstadt, many rejoinders, etc.) in *Löscher*, Vol. III., p. 203 sq. *Walch*, Vol. XV., p. 954 sq. *Seidemann*, The Leipsig Disputation, A. D. 1519, from hitherto unexplored sources, Dresden, 1843.

[2] The official report of this disputation is in *Löscher*, Vol. III., p. 203–558; *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XV., p. 998 sq., and in *de Wette*, Letters of Luther, Vol. I. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 80–94; 2d ed., p. 134 sq. *Wiedemann*, John Eck, p. 75–139; and "*The Catholic*," year 1872, in several articles from September onward.

Hosted by Google

A new adversary to Luther, but less formidable than Eck, now came forth in the person of *Jerome Emser* of Leipsig, a licentiate of canon law, and private secretary to Duke George of Saxony. He was an excellent scholar, possessed a good knowledge of the ancient and Oriental languages, was brilliant and caustic in repartee, and withal a man of extraordinary erudition.[1] By mutual agreement, their discussion was to be reported, collected, and sent to the Universities of *Erfurt* and *Paris*, whose authorities were to decide on the merits of the respective arguments, and, pending the decision, no aggressive steps were to be taken by either side. Luther and his friends disregarded the pledge, and a fresh controversial war broke out.

Notwithstanding that Luther had been completely beaten in the great disputation in the Pleissenburg at Leipsig, he gained the solid advantage of giving publicity to his cause, and heightening its importance in the estimation of the populace. The questions in dispute were now in every mouth. It was in the theological congress that Luther gained to his side the most important of his disciples. This was *Philip Melanchthon* ("Schwarzerd," i. e. Blackearth).[2] His father was a skilled armorer of Bretten, in the Palatinate of the Rhine, where Philip was born February 16, 1497, and the famous Reuchlin

[1] *Hieron. Emser*, De disputatione Lipsiensi quantum ad Boemos obiter deflexa est, in August. 1519. In answer to Luther's Ad Aegocerotem Emserianum M. Lutheri responsio, Emser wrote A venatione Lutheriana Aegocerotis assertio in November, 1518 (*Lutheri* opp. lat. Jen., T. I., *Löscher*, Vol. III.) Why the interpretation of Luther had been forbidden to the common people (sc. because it contained fourteen hundred lies and heretical errors.) Lps. 1523. German translation of the New Testament, Dresden, 1527; Assertio Missae; De Canone Missae; and sti l earlier, De vita et miraculis S. Bennonis. Cf. the *Aschbach* and *Freiburg* Cyclopaedias, art. "Emser."

[2] *Melanchthon*. Opp., Basil. 1541 sq., 5 T. in fol., recensuit *Peucer*, Vitenbergae, 1562 sq., 4 T. fol., and commenced in the Corpus Reformator., ed. *Bretschneider*, T. I.–X., Melanchthon. opp., Hal. 1834-42, 4to. — *Camerarius*, de Ph. Mel. ortu, totius vitae curric. et morte narratio, Lps. 1566, ed. *Augusti*, Vrat. 1817. *Matthes*, The Life of Philip Melanchthon, from the Sources, Altenburg, 1841; 2d ed. 1846. *Galle*, Melanchthon considered as a Theologian, and the Development of his doctrine, Halle, 1840. *Heppe*, 2d ed., Marburg, 1860. *Planck*, Melanchthon, praeceptor Germ., Nördl. 1860. *C. Schmidt*, Life and select Writings of Melanchthon, Elberfeld, 1861.

Hosted by Google

was his uncle. After making an excellent course of preparatory studies at Pforzheim and afterward at Heidelberg, where he took the degree of Batchelor of Philosophy in 1512, he went in the same year to Tübingen, completed his scientific studies, and in 1513 published a Greek grammar, took his degree of Master of Arts in 1514, and began to give lectures on the classics and Aristotelian philosophy. He was accounted a literary prodigy, and his name and accomplishments were the theme of every tongue. More gentle, moderate, and prudent than Luther, he lacked his master's energy, strength of character, depth of feeling, magnetic influence, and vigor of speech. Still, he rendered very essential service to Luther, who was not unfrequently guided by his counsels. When a little more than twenty-one years of age (August 29, 1518), he was appointed, through the recommendation of Erasmus, professor of Greek language and literature at *Wittenberg*. An intimacy soon sprung up between himself and Luther, for whom he had always great respect, and in whose defense he wrote an *apology*.[1] Elated with the adulation of his young friend, and encouraged by the Hussites, with whom he had lately opened a correspondence,[2] Luther soon forgot his humiliating defeat at Leipsic, put aside all disguise, stifled any lingering feelings of reverence for the Church of Rome, and laid bare to the world a heart which had so long nourished a fierce and fiery spirit of revolt.

It had been agreed that the arguments advanced by both sides in the Leipsig disputation should be submitted before publication to the judgment of the theological faculties of the Universities of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne. The decisions, rendered in the months of August and November, 1519, were adverse to Luther; his teaching was unanimously condemned. Immediately on learning the result, he poured forth upon the members of these faculties, whom but a little while

[1] Defensio Melanchthonis contra Eccium, prof. theologiae. Melanchthon either forgot or disregarded the promise of his master, and published at Wittenberg a letter, addressed to Œcolampadius, giving a summary of the discussion at Leipsig, but at the same time recognizing the fine talents of Eck. *Audin*, l. c., p. 106 (Phil., 1841); Eng. ed., (London, 1854), Vol. I., p. 209. (Tr.)

[2] *Löscher*, Vol. III., p. 699 sq. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 88 sq.; 2d ed., p. 151 sq.

Hosted by Google

before he had called his masters in theology, a torrent of savage and abusive invective.[1]

The movements of Miltitz could not keep pace with the impetuous energy of Luther, who, wearying of the Nuncio's tardiness, dispatched to Leo a letter, dated October 11, 1520, accompanied with his treatise on *Christian Liberty*, dedicated to the Pope. In this letter, he pours out all the venom of his soul against Rome, and flings the coarsest insults at the Pope. Here is a specimen: "It were a blessing for you (Leo) to lay down the office of the Papacy, which only your most depraved enemies can exultingly represent as an honor, and live upon the trifling income of a priest or your hereditary fortune. Only children of perdition, like Judas Iscariot and his imitators, should revel in the honors of which you are the object."[2] The coarse, indecent tone of this letter would of itself have justified the sentence, already passed upon Luther through the representations of Eck, if it had been more severe than it was. Luther, anticipating the blow and fearing its consequences, *had recourse to his usual cunning and dexterity when such calamities impended*, and sought to rob the papal condemnation of its terrors in the eyes of the people by largely circulating his Sermon on Excommunication.

§ 301. *Fresh Writings of Luther—Affinity of His Religious System to the Code of the Robber Knights and the Principles of Paganism.*

Moehler, Symbolism (1832), 6th ed., Mentz, 1843, Engl. transl. †*Hilgers*, Theology of Symbolism, Bonn, 1841. *Riffel*, 2d ed., Vol. I., p. 28 sq. *Staudenmaier*, Philos. of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 684 sq. *Stöckl*, Hist. of the Philosophy of the M. A., Vol. III., p. 477 sq. Cf. also "Luther, considered as the solution of a psychological problem" (Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vols. II. and III.) *Vorreiter*, Luther's struggle with the anti-Christian principles of the Revolution, Halle, 1861.

Luther had not yet formally declared his opposition to the Church; but he soon spoke out emphatically and unmistakably against both her and her authority. During the years

[1] Luther's Works, *Walch's* ed., Vol. XV., p. 1598 sq.

[2] Luther's Works, *Walch's* ed., Vol. XV., p. 934 sq.; *de Wette*, Vol. I., p. 497 sq. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 151 sq.; 2d ed., p. 221 sq.

Hosted by Google

1520 and 1521, he displayed an astonishing literary activity. It would seem that he would have the world bow to his *ipse dixit*. He would brook no contradiction; whoever would set himself against him must be prepared for a death-struggle; he spared no one. His *religious* system was a *pantheistical mysticism*—not indeed the outcome of his controversy on indulgences, but the result of his *youthful stubbornness* and perversity, and of his subsequent *wayward and erratic religious exercises*. It combined in one complex organism the errors of the *Gnostics*, Cathari, Waldenses; of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, and the Apostolic Brethren; of Amalric of Bena, Master Eckhart, Wickliffe, Huss, and the author of the "German Theology," who, all of them, because they were sectaries, have been represented by Protestant authors as the forerunners of the pseudo-Reformers.[1] Such is the system which, it was claimed, has its full and adequate sanction in Holy Scripture. It teaches that the Bible is the *only source* of faith; ascribes to it the *completest inspiration*, extending to every word, and invests the reading of it with a *quasi-sacramental character*. Its leading tenets were the following: *Human nature* has been wholly corrupted by original sin, and hence man is born *without a trace of freedom*. Whatever he does, be it good or ill, is not *his own*, but God's work. *Faith alone* works justification, and man is saved by confidently believing that God, who covereth sins and doth not impute them to man (Ps. xxxi. 1, 2), will pardon him. This proposition is one wonderfully fruitful in consequences, inasmuch as it secures man a full pardon of his sins, and an unconditional release from the punishment due to them. Its scope is so comprehensive, and its conditions so easy, that no Pope has ever pretended to lay claim to anything at all comparable to it.[2] The *hierarchy* and the *priesthood* are unneces-

[1] The name of Reformer was first applied to these men by *Luther* in his preface to the German Theology. It was also adopted by *Flacius Illyricus*, Catalog. testium veritatis. *G. Arnold*, Historia et descriptio theol. myst., Francof. 1702, p. 306; *Flathe*, Hist. of the forerunners of the Reformation, etc.

[2] When charged with having arbitrarily introduced the word *sola* into Rom. iii. 28, he made the following defense: "Should your Pope give himself any useless annoyance about the word *sola*, you may promptly reply: It is the will

Hosted by Google

sary, and exterior worship is useless. To clothe one's body in sacred and priestly garments; to be bodily present in church and busy oneself about holy things; to pray, to fast, to keep watch, or to go through other good works of any sort whatever to the end of time, all these avail the soul nothing. All Sacraments, excepting Baptism, Holy Eucharist, and Penance, are rejected, and even these if withheld may be supplied by faith.[1] There is a universal priesthood; every Christian may assume that office; there is no need of a special body of men set apart and ordained to dispense the mysteries of God, and, as a consequence, no *visible Church* or special means established by God whereby man may work out his salvation.[2]

The idea of a *universal priesthood*, so flattering to the bulk of the people, was set forth with special prominence and emphasis in his more inflammatory writings, such as the "*Ad-*

---

of Dr. Martin Luther that it should be so. He says that '*Pope and jackass are synonymous terms.*' We are the masters of the papists, not their schoolboys and disciples, and will not be dictated to by them." (Altona ed., T. V., fol. 2690.)—"As many as *believe* in Christ, be they as numerous and wicked as may be, will be neither responsible for their works nor condemned on account of them."—"*Unbelief* is the only sin man can be guilty of; whenever the name of sin is applied to other acts, it is a misnomer; such acts are of a piece with those of little Johnny or Maudlin, when they retire to a corner to relieve nature; people may laugh at them, but will add—well done."—"In this way does *faith* destroy any bad odor our filth may emit" (Family Bible with Commentary, Jena ed., 1565; Sermon on the text: "So much hath God loved the world").—"Provided one have faith, adultery is no sin; but should one be destitute of faith, even though he honor God, he is guilty of a wholly idolatrous act."

[1] "*Let all men be free as to the Sacraments;* if one does not wish to be baptized, he need not; he may, if he likes, refuse to receive the Sacraments; he has authority from God not to confess, if he dislikes to do so" (Treatise on Confession). In the early days of his career as a reformer, Luther certainly held that the Sacraments are optional; he, however, retracted this teaching, after Carlstadt had pushed his principles to their legitimate conclusions.

[2] "All Christians enjoy in common the spiritual priesthood, and may take on them the office of preaching in its true sense; we are all priests in Christ; all have power and authority to judge.—Every Christian is a *father*, a *confessor* of the heavenly ordained confession, an office which the Pope arrogates to himself, as he also does in the matter of the keys, the episcopate, and everything else—oh the Robber! Nay, I will go still further, and say, let no one secretly confess to a priest *as such*, but as to one like himself, as to a brother and a Christian."

Hosted by Google

dress to the Christian Nobles of Germany," "*On the Improvement of Christian Morality*," "*On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*," addressed to the clergy, and on "*Christian Liberty*," addressed to the laity. In these he called upon the Emperor to subvert the power of the Pope, to confiscate for his own use investitures and the goods of the Church, to do away with ecclesiastical feasts and holidays, and, finally, to abolish Masses for the dead; for the latter, he said, were designed to supply the means of "feasting and revelry." Luther was encouraged to put forward these startling doctrines in bold and aggressive language by the powerful *Knights of the Empire*, who, he said, in the fatalistic language so accordant with his views, were sent of Heaven for his defense.[1] He was now in bad company, and, quite contrary to his deep religious convictions and feelings, found himself obliged to fall in with the views of men who were pagan at heart, and whose ultimate aims were diametrically opposed to his own. One of these was *Ulrich von Hutten*,[2] the descendant of an ancient and knightly house in Franconia. Destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical state, he was sent to the cloister-school of Fulda, and, catching the spirit of the age, applied himself with enthusiastic fervor to the study of the pagan classics. He became a fine classical scholar, but at the expense of his faith and his virtue. He fled from the monastery; led for many years a life of shameless debauchery, and, disregardful of the commonest rules of decency, which even a libertine respects, gave a detailed account in elegant Latin verse of the progress of a loathsome disease brought on by his excesses. By turn a soldier, a pamphleteer, and a poet; always

[1] Luther returned the following answer to a letter of Sylvester of Schaumburg: "Quod ut non contemno, ita nolo nisi Christo protectore niti, qui forte et hunc ei spiritum (of assisting him) dedit." *De Wette*, Vol. I., p. 448.

[2] Opp. ed. **Boecking*, Lips. 1859 sq. *Weislinger*, Huttenus delarvatus, Constantiae, 1730. *Panzer*, Ulrich of Hutten with reference to literature, Nürnberg, 1798. *David Strauss*, Ulrich of Hutten, Lps. 1858 sq., 3 vols. Cf. Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. 45. *Meiners*, Biography of celebrated men in the times of the Renaissance, Zürich, 1796–97, 3 vols. He likewise speaks of *Francis of Sickingen* (Vol. III.); cf. *Hub. Leodit* lib. de rebus gestis et calamitoso obitu Fr. de Sickingen (*Freher*, T. III., p. 295). *C. Ferd. Meyer* (of Zürich), The last days of Hutten's Life, being "a work of fiction," Lps. 1872.

Hosted by Google

dreaded and sometimes admired; ever seeking out an occasion to display his powers, he was glad when an opportunity was given him of taking part in the quarrel between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn. Words failed him to express his fulsome praises of the former, or to adequately convey the torrent of invective and libelous abuse which he belched forth against the latter, and applied indiscriminately to the whole body of the clergy (*Triumphus Capnionis*). Besides openly and publicly proclaiming that he was in league with twenty free-thinkers for the avowed purpose of extirpating the monks, this vaunted advocate of liberty and humanity did not blush to detail, with a refinement of cruelty that would have chilled the heart of a headsman, the tortures and manner of death it would gladden his soul to see the baptized Jew Pfefferkorn undergo, and for no other reason than because the latter had been the first to call the attention of the Church to certain Hebrew books of a dangerous tendency. Like Luther, he shortly left off the use of the Latin, a language which he had hitherto employed, and in its place substituted the *German*, as a more convenient and efficient vehicle for revolutionizing thoughts. "It has been my wont," he said, "in the past to employ the Latin language exclusively; but in so doing I reached only a few, whereas I *now appeal to my country*." He closed his life on the island of Ufenau, in the Lake of Zürich. The work, which gave special notoriety to this league, was the pamphlet entitled "*Epistolae virorum obscurorum*,"[1] directed against the monks, published together with *Lorenzo Valla's* book "On the Fictitious Donation of Constantine the Great to Pope Sylvester," and preceded by an ironical dedication to Pope Leo X.[2] These caustic satires and malignant lampoons, containing offensive and obscene illustrations by the celebrated *Luke Cranach*, were openly offered for sale at the church-doors side by side with books of devotion.[3] No means

[1] See Vol. II., p. 1010, note 2.

[2] Conf. *Kampschulte*, The University of Erfurt, Pt. I., p. 192-226.

[3] Satires and Pasquinades of the age of the Reformation, published by *Oscar Schade*, Hanov. 1856–58, 3 vols. Unpleasant for many a Protestant: *Dr. Thomas Murner* (Franciscan of Strasburg's) Poem of the Great Lutheran Fool, published by *Dr. Henry Kurz*, Zürich, 1848. Vilmar, in his History of German

Hosted by Google

were neglected by Hutten and his party for the accomplishment of their purposes. To give the monks a more complete overthrow, they sought the alliance of princes. "We must," said Hutten in a letter to *Pirkheimer*, "employ every means to gain them; we must never leave off pressing our suit; we must accept from them offices public and private, for it is thus jurists and theologians secure and retain their favor." Hence we see that previously to Luther's expulsion from the Church, a league had been formed, having nothing in common with the pseudo-mystical tendencies of the so-called reformer; but, on the contrary, wholly pagan in character, and representing a radically materialistic reaction against the Church, her religious system, and her deposit of revealed truths.[1] There was but one bond that could unite these parties, whose principles, at least in their origin, were diametrically opposed—the one claiming to be purely spiritual, and the other known to be essentially materialistic in its aims—and that was the *common bond of hatred* against the Church.

Hutten, by birth a Knight of the Empire, well knew how to excite in the hearts of the nobles, who, though they had long plundered the property of the Church, had never ventured to resist her authority, a spirit of hatred against the clergy as violent as had ever been entertained by the Humanists and philologists. The warlike habits of these knights had obliterated every principle of justice from their minds, and stifled every humane feeling. Their maxim was: "To ride and to rob is no shame; the best in the land do the same." They also ingenuously professed to believe that the wealth of such low fellows as commercial men was the lawful plunder of nobles. All these distinguishing characteristics of the nobility of the Empire were combined and obtained their fullest expression in *Francis of Sickingen*, a most complete specimen of the degeneracy into which the chivalry of the age had fallen. Putting aside all restraints to the widest

Literature, says of it: "It is the most important satirical writing that ever appeared on the Reformation."

[1] The articles: Luther's alliance with the Aristocracy of the Empire, and preparations for the war of Sickingen. (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., p. 465–482; p. 577–593; p. 669–678; p. 725–732.)

Hosted by Google

freedom of action, his conduct was no longer the result of that exalted standard of virtue, which, in preceding ages, where chivalry, whether in the service of the Church or the Empire, was wholly devoted to the interests and advancement of truth, justice, and religion, was its crowning glory. His aims were selfish, and his motives sordid. He was ever ready to draw his sword in the most iniquitous of causes when such gave promise of pecuniary reward. His ability as a military leader recommended him to Francis I. and Charles V., who were at times rivals for his services. He was, by turn, under the ban of the Empire as a disturber of the public peace, and high in the imperial favor as a commander of armies. *To the material force, of which he was the representative, inveterately and persistently hostile to public order, did Luther address himself.* Sickingen, however, cared as little as Hutten for the religious opinions of Luther. He encouraged the controversy on indulgences, and favored the revolt against the Church to which it led, only because these supplied an occasion to work mischief and furnished a means of inciting the masses to rebellion, thereby bringing about the revolution he was meditating against the Empire. Although an agitator, a revolutionist, and a disturber of the public peace, he was never in sympathy with Luther, and continued to the last steadfast in his fidelity to the Catholic Church. At his prayer, Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, by an instrument, dated May 10, 1520, authorized the erection and endowment of a chapel, and granted an indulgence of forty days to all who should visit it. He had also the intention, in 1519, of founding a Franciscan convent, but was driven from his purpose by the sneers of Hutten. Though Hutten's caustic raillery might deter Sickingen from founding a religious house, his influence could not draw him to the cause of Luther. "Who is he," was his reply to the suggestion, "that dares attempt to overthrow institutions which have survived to the present day? If such there be, and he have the requisite courage for the undertaking, does he not lack the power?"

Hosted by Google

§ 302. *Luther's Condemnation.*

Shortly after the close of the disputation of Leipsig, Dr. Eck set out for Rome, in order by his presence to urge Leo to take more prompt and decisive measures than might be looked for from the dilatory and over-cautious policy of Miltitz. He had many difficulties to face and much opposition to overcome in the Consistory, but his appeals and representations were in the end successful. The bull, "*Exsurge Domine et judica causam tuam*,"[1] was issued June 15, 1520, in which forty-one propositions, extracted from the writings of Luther, were condemned, his works ordered to be burnt wherever found, and he himself excommunicated if he should not have retracted at the expiration of sixty days. The Pope exhorted and prayed him and his followers by the Blood of Christ, shed for the redemption of man and the foundation of the Church, to cease to disturb the peace of the Spouse of Christ, to destroy her unity, and outrage her sacred and unchangeable truths. But should he disregard these entreaties, refuse to avail himself of this paternal kindness and tenderness, and persist in his errors, he was declared excommunicate, liable to the penalties attached to the crime of heresy, and all Christian princes were instructed to apprehend him and send him to Rome. The execution of this bull was given to the Papal Legates, Carraccioli and Aleandro, and to these Dr. Eck was joined. That one like Eck, holding no superior rank as a churchman, should have been made a member of this commission, of itself gave no little offense. But apart from this, he had been and was still Luther's most formidable and implacable enemy; and he was now the bearer of his sentence.

[1] This bull, composed by Card. Ascolti, is written in pure, graceful, and elegant Latinity. *Audin*, l. c., London, 1854, Vol. I., p. 224. It is given in *Harduin*, Collectio conc., T. IX., p. 1891; in *Coquellinus*, Bullarium, T. III., Pt. III., p. 487 sq. *Raynald.* ad an. 1520; Concil. Trid. ed., Lps. 1842, p. 270–72. In German, with the carping observations of *Hutten;* in *Walch*, Vol. XV., p. 1691 sq. Luther wrote against this bull: Reasons and Causes in favor of all those who have been unjustly condemned by the Roman Bull, Germ. Works, Jena ed., Pt. I., p. 400–432.

Hosted by Google

Luther considered that, under the circumstances, the acceptance by him of so ungracious an office, was clear evidence of personal vindictiveness. His own condemnation coming to him through such a source he regarded, says *Pallavicini*, as a stealthy stab from the poniard of a malignant foe, rather than a lawfully authorized blow from a Roman lictor's ax. Hence, to represent Eck's successful journey beyond the Alps as undertaken from motives of revenge, and as being in some sort an encroachment upon the rights of the German bishops, was not a difficult task. Moreover, *it is said*, that Eck of his own authority extended the excommunication to many of Luther's adherents, and among them *Carlstadt* and *Dolcius*, professors at Wittenberg; *Pirkheimer* and *Spengler*, councillors of Nürnberg; and *Adelmannsfelden*, a nobleman and canon of Augsburg. The last circumstance put many obstacles in the way of publishing the bull and carrying its instructions into execution, particularly in districts where public feeling ran high. Luther, with his usual dexterity, hastened to counteract the effect it might have upon the public mind, by publishing his pamphlet *On the New Eckian Bulls*.[1] Eck was insulted at Leipsig, and forced to seek safety in flight, and the Papal bull was made the jest of the populace. Similar outbreaks took place at Erfurt. But at Mentz, Cologne, Halberstadt, Freisingen, Eichstaedt, Merseburg, Meissen, Brandenburg, and other places, the bull was published, and Luther's writings burnt. The Elector of Saxony ordered Luther to communicate once more with the Pope. Luther complied, but his tone was far from conciliatory. He forwarded to Leo his pamphlet *On the New Eckian Bulls*, accompanied with his discourse on *Christian Liberty*.

Charles V., son of Philip the Fair, who, when only twenty years of age, and after a sharp contest with foreign competitors, had succeeded his grandfather Maximilian as Emperor, besides having inherited the ancient attachment of the House of Hapsburg to the traditional teachings of the Church, had received strong religious impressions from his preceptor, Adrian of Utrecht, whom he afterward was in-

[1] In *Riffel* (2d ed.), Vol. I., p. 242; 1st ed., Vol. I., p. 170 sq.

Hosted by Google

strumental in raising to the papal throne.[1] After his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle (October 22, 1520), the bull excommunicating Luther was placed in his hands by the Legates Carraccioli and Aleandro. Luther was as yet uncertain as to the temper of the new Emperor and the course he would pursue. Hoping to secure his good will, he addressed him a *most humble* letter,[2] in which, among other things, he stated that in publishing his pamphlets he had no aim in view other than to brush away superstitious notions and the delusions of human tradition, and establish in their stead the truths of the Gospel. And for this, he went on to say, have I endured these *three* years the angry abuse of men and every sort of evil. He concluded by stating that he had in vain sued for mercy and implored pardon; his enemies had made up their minds to it that the Gospel, Divine truth, and himself should perish together; to avert so great an evil, he, like Athanasius of old, invoked the Emperor's protection.

The Elector of Saxony, who had come as far as the Rhine to welcome the Emperor on his arrival, had a conference with *Erasmus* at Cologne, in the course of which the latter gave it as his opinion that Luther's fault chiefly consisted in his having aimed a blow at the tiara of the Pope and the bellies of the monks. The judgment had certainly the merit of being brief and pointed; but to be merry on so grave and momentous a subject was unseemly, and little to the credit of Erasmus. Nevertheless, on the strength of it, the Elector de-

[1] *Lang*, Correspondence of Emperor Charles V., published from the Royal Library and the Bibliothèque de Bourgoigne, at Brussels, Lps. 1844 sq., 6 vols. *Heine*, Letters addressed to Charles V. (1530–32) by his Father Confessor, from the Spanish Royal archives at Simancas, Brl. 1848. *Autobiography* of Charles V. in a Portuguese translation, rediscovered at Brussels by *Kervin de Lettenhove*. German, by *Warnkoenig*, Brussels, 1862. Conf. *Hist.* and *Political* Papers, Vol. 50, p. 857 sq., and *Ranke*, Complete Works, Vol. VI., p. 73 sq. *Robertson*, History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V., Edinburgh, 1769; Vienna, 1787, 4 vols. Favorable portraiture of Charles V., in *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the end of the fifteenth century, Vol. I., passim, particularly p. 580–586; rather unfavorable because partial representation by *Maurenbrecher*, Charles V. and the German Protestants from 1545 to 1555, together with an appendix of *documents* drawn from the Spanish archives of Simancas, Düsseldorf, 1865. Conf. *Reusch*, Review of Theology, Bonn, 1866, p. 817–824.

[2] In *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. XV., p. 1636. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 103 sq.

Hosted by Google

manded that the Legates should submit the whole matter for examination to a court, composed of sober, religious, and impartial men; and that Luther's teachings should be disproved *by authority of Scripture.* Luther, now spurning papal prohibitions, and notably that of Paul II. in the bull *Exsecrabilis,* and without waiting for an answer from Leo, appealed (November 17, 1520), on the authority of the decrees of Constance, declaring a Council superior to the Pope, from the Holy See to an Ecumenical Synod; after having previously published, on the 4th of the same month, his violent protest "*Against the Execrable Bull of Antichrist.*" Not content with these bold and aggressive acts, he went still further, and on December 10, 1520, having called together the students of the University and the inhabitants of Wittenberg at the Elster or Eastern Gate of the city, where fagots had been heaped up, ready to set fire to, he appeared bearing the bull of Leo, printed in characters large enough to be seen by all present. The Body of Canon Law, many scholastic and casuistical works, the controversial writings of Eck (the Chrysoprasus, etc.) and Emser, were first cast into the flames,[1] after which Luther flung the Pope's bull into the pile, exclaiming: "Thou hast disturbed the Lord's Holy One, therefore shalt thou be consigned to fire eternal." As Luther had already given public notice by posters of what he intended to do with the bull, now that the work was accomplished, he hastened to announce his triumph to Spalatinus.[2] On the following day, he addressed the students, saying: "It is now full time that the Pope himself were burned. My meaning is," he went on to say, "that the Papal Chair, its false teachings and abominations, should be committed to the flames." The Emperor, sensible that matters were going from bad to worse, convoked his first diet at Worms.

§ 303. *The Diet of Worms,* 1521—*Luther at Wartburg.*

Cochlaeus (Col., 1568), p. 55 sq. *Pallavicini,* Hist. conc. Trid., lib. I., c. 25. *Sarpi,* Hist. conc. Trid., lib. I., c. 21 sq. — Acta *Lutheri* in conciliis Vormat.

[1] *Audin,* l. c. (London, 1854), Vol. I., p. 234. (TR.)

[2] Lutheri ep. ad Spalat.: "Impossibile est enim salvos fieri, qui huic bullae foverunt aut non repugnarunt" (*De Wette,* Vol. I., p. 522).

Hosted by Google

ed. Policarius, Vit., 1546 (Luth. opp. lat. Jenae, T. II., p. 436 sq. German Works, Jena ed., Pt. I., p. 432–463). *Raynald.* ad an. 1521. *Walz*, The Diet of Worms, 1521 (Researches on German Hist. VIII., 21–44); *Friedrich*, The Diet at Worms, 1521, according to letters of *Aleander* (in the Debates of the Royal Acad. of Sciences of Bavaria, Class III., Vol. XI., year 1870, sect. 3). *Riffel*, Vol. I., 2d ed., p. 224 sq.

The Emperor had at first intended to summon Luther before the diet. Aleandro objected, because, to submit to the discussion of a secular court questions which had been already disposed of by the Holy See, and their author excommunicated, he regarded as disgraceful. His words had much weight in Germany, because, though a Lombard by birth, he was popularly believed to be a German; and his lectures in Paris on Greek literature and Ausonius, delivered before two thousand hearers, had given him name and influence with the Humanists. He demanded that the provisions of the bull against Luther should be fully carried out (January 3, 1521).

The evil effects of centralizing all ecclesiastical authority in Rome, on the one hand, and on the other, *of leaving off holding ecclesiastical synods* in Germany, before which the questions raised by Luther should have been brought, were now painfully apparent.[1] The Emperor was not fully alive to the scope and importance of the questions involved in the controversy until after the Legate had clearly pointed out that Luther's attitude toward the Holy See threatened, not only the stability of the Church, but the very existence of the Empire and the well-being of society. The States, however, refused to yield to Aleandro's demand; for having themselves brought forward *one hundred and one Grievances* (*Gravamina*) touching abuses in ecclesiastical affairs,[2] they were unwilling to condemn Luther without a hearing. Moreover, George, Duke of Saxony, a determined enemy of Luther's, brought before the diet *twelve specific complaints*, including some against the abuse of indulgences and the lax morals of the clergy. He also strenuously advocated the holding of an Ecumenical Council.

Luther, in the meantime, ordered his conduct to suit the circumstances, now professing himself humble and submis-

[1] Cf. *Wiedemann*, John Eck, p. 137 and p. 385.

[2] *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. XV., p. 2058 sq.

Hosted by Google

sive, and again haughtily proclaiming his intention of holding out against all opposition. Influenced more by the Emperor's safe-conduct and the assistance promised from another quarter, than by reliance on Divine aid, he finally made up his mind to go to Worms, where he arrived April 16. Under the circumstances, it required no special tax upon his courage to write to Spalatinus, as if apprehensive of the fate of Huss: "Yes, I shall go to Worms, even if there were as many devils there as there are tiles on the roofs of Wittenberg." Luther went before the imperial diet, where the Emperor was present, on the 17th and 18th of April.

On the former of these days, *John von Eck*, Chancellor to the Archbishop of Treves, pointing to close upon twenty volumes placed upon a table near by, asked Luther, first, if he acknowledged himself the author of these writings published under his name; and, secondly, if he was willing to retract the teachings contained therein. After hearing the titles of the books read, Luther, in answer to the first question, admitted their authorship, but requested time for consideration before answering the second. A day was given him to prepare his reply, and on the morrow the Chancellor again asked him if he would retract. Luther was evasive. The Chancellor pressed for a categorical answer. "Will you or will you not retract?" said he, addressing him. Luther replied: "Inasmuch as it is certain that both Popes and Councils have time and again fallen into error, and denied at one time what they had affirmed at another, I can not bring myself to put faith in them. My conscience is captive to the words of God, and unless I shall be convicted of error by Scripture proof or by plain reason, I neither can nor will retract anything. God help me. Amen."[1]

At a subsequent conference, *Dr. John von Eck*, the Chancellor, and *Cochlaeus*, Dean of the Church of the Holy Virgin at Frankfort, pointed out to Luther that he was inconsistent and *ex-parte* in his appeal to Holy Scripture—first, because he would accept no rule of interpretation but *his own private judgment*, and, next, because of arbitrarily rejecting certain

[1] The dramatic words hitherto attributed to him: "Here I stand, how else can I act?" are a later addition. Cf. *Burkhardt*, Studies and Criticisms, 1869, nro. 3.

Hosted by Google

Books, he had virtually called in question the authority of all.[1] They further reminded him that the authors of every heresy that had rent the Church from the earliest days to their own, had sought in Scripture the justification of their errors. But their arguments and the entreaties of *Cochlaeus*, who visited him privately some days later, were all to no purpose. "Even if I should retract," said he, "the *others* (*Humanists*), men far more learned than myself, would not keep silence, or cease to carry on the work."[2] A committee, composed of princes and bishops, and including, besides oth-

[1] This is the style in which Luther speaks of the Pentateuch: "We have no wish either to see or hear Moses. Let us leave Moses to the Jews, to whom he was given to serve as a *Mirror of Saxony;* he has nothing in common with Pagans and Christians, and we should take no notice of him. Just as France esteems the *Mirror of Saxony* only in so far as it is the expression of natural law, so also the Mosaic legislation, though admirably suited to the Jews, has no binding force whatever as regards ourselves. Moses is the prince and exemplar of all executioners; in striking terror into the hearts of men, in inflicting torture, and in tyrannizing, he is without a rival." . . . Of Ecclesiastes, the Heresiarch says: "This book should be more complete; it is mutilated; it is like a cavalier riding without boots or spurs; just as I used to do while I was still a monk." . . . Of Judith and Tobias: "As it seems to me, Judith is a tragedy, in which the end of all tyrants may be learned. As to Tobias, it is a comedy, in which there is a great deal of talk about women. It contains many amusing and silly stories." . . . Of Ecclesiasticus: "The author of this book is an excellent expounder of the Law, or a Jurist; he also gives good precepts for exterior deportment; but he is not a prophet, and knows simply nothing about Christ." . . . Of the Second Machabees: "I have so great an aversion to this book and that of Esther, that I almost wish they did not exist; they are full of observances characteristically Jewish and of Pagan abominations." . . . Of the Four Gospels: "The first three speak of the works of Our Lord rather than of His oral teaching; that of St. John is the only sympathetic, the only true Gospel; and should be undoubtedly preferred to the others. In like manner, the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul are superior to the first three Gospels." . . . Of the Epistles to the Hebrews: "It need not surprise one to find here bits of wood, hay, and straw." . . . Of the Epistle of St. James: "Compared with the Epistles of St. Paul, this is in truth an epistle of straw; it contains absolutely nothing to remind one of the style of the Gospel." . . . Of the Apocalypse: "There are many things objectionable in this book. To my mind, it bears upon it no marks of an Apostolic or prophetic character. It is not the habit of the Apostles to speak in metaphors; on the contrary, when they utter a prophecy, they do so in clear and precise terms. Every one may form his own judgment of this book; as for myself, I feel an aversion to it, and to me this is sufficient reason for rejecting it."

[2] Dr. *Otto*, The Conference of Cochlaeus with Luther at Worms, 1521 (Austr. Quart. of Theol. 1866, nro. 1).—*Hennes*, Luther's Sojourn at Worms, Mentz, 1868.

Hosted by Google

ers, Drs. Eck and Cochlaeus, advised Luther to submit to the judgment of a general council; but the monk was inexorable. To the Archbishop of Treves, *Richard von Greifenklau*, who requested him to suggest his own method of adjusting matters, he replied by quoting the words of Gamaliel: "If this work be of man, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye can not overthrow it." Apart from his obstinate adherence to his errors, and his rejection of every overture looking toward an authoritative decision, Luther had given much offense by his bibulous habits and his unseemly familiarities with females;[1] and, on the day after his conference with the Archbishop of Treves (April 26), being provided with a safe-conduct for twenty-one days, was ordered to quit Worms. His ostensible destination was Wittenberg; but while on his way, and probably by preconcerted arrangement[2] between himself and the Elector of Saxony, he was set upon by five masked and armed men, seized and carried away a willing prisoner to the Castle of *Wartburg*, near *Eisenach*, where he remained from May, 1521, till March 8, 1522, living incognito under the assumed name of Younker George, and dressed as a knight. On the 26th of May, when many of the States had already, as it seems unadvisedly, withdrawn from the diet, an imperial decree drawn up by Aleandro, and dated May 8th, placing Luther under *the ban of the Empire*, was signed by the Emperor, and officially promulgated. It would appear that Luther courted this sentence, for previously to its promulgation he boastfully declared, that "*If Huss had been a heretic, he himself was surely ten times as great a one.*"

The decree commanded all persons, under severe penalties, to refuse hospitality to Luther; to seize his person, and deliver him up to the officers of the Empire, and to commit his writings to the flames.[3] On the Imperial Chamber of Nürnberg was laid the duty of seeing to it that the various provisions of the sentence were carried into effect. It was now very generally believed that there was an end of the heresy; that the last act of the tragedy had been performed: but a

[1] Conf. below, § 319, the letter of Count *Hoyer of Mansfeld*, written 1522.
[2] See Luther's Letters, in *de Wette*, Vol. II., pp. 3, 7, 89.
[3] Cf. *Riffel*, 1st ed., Vol. I., pp. 213–217; 2d ed., Vol. I., pp. 290–294.

Hosted by Google

few far-seeing men thought otherwise, and predicted that the storm, far from having spent itself, was still gathering strength. "There is, as some think, an end of the tragedy," wrote the Spanish courtier, *Alphonso Valdez*,[1] to his friend Peter Martyr; "but as for myself, I am fully convinced that the play is only opening, for the Germans are highly incensed against the Holy See."

In a strong rescript sent to the States of the Empire, bearing the date of April 19, 1521, the Emperor had expressed his determination to oppose a powerful resistance to the religious tendencies in Germany; but this was in the existing circumstances impossible, for the civil discords of Spain and the desperate war he was then waging against France called forth his best energies and claimed his undivided attention.

Hence, beyond the limits of the Emperor's own states and those of his brother, Ferdinand, and of the Elector of Brandenburg, the Duke of Bavaria, Duke George of Saxony, and a few ecclesiastical princes, the edict of Worms was but feebly executed, if at all. It was coldly received by the representatives of the States of Germany, who had been industriously taught to believe that this theological quarrel was no more than *a struggle against Rome*, in the destruction of whose claims they fancied they saw the realization of wild dreams and delusive hopes.

A number of propositions extracted from the works of Luther were condemned by the Faculty of the *Sorbonne*, at Paris,[2] and by others of lesser note, and refuted by *Henry VIII.*[3] of England; but owing to the preoccupation of men's

[1] Habes hujus tragoediae, ut quidam volunt, finem, ut egomet mihi persuadeo, non finem sed initium; nam video Germanorum animos graviter in sedem Romanam concitari. (ep. ad Petr. Martyr.) For other letters of *A. Valdez*, see Lessing supra. When the Papal Legate, Chieregati, remarked that if Hungary should be lost, Germany would also pass under the yoke of the Turk, the malcontents replied: "We had much rather be under the Turk than under you, who are the last and greatest of God's enemies, and are the very slave of abomination."

[2] Condemnatio doctr. Luther. per facultatem Paris, in *le Plat*, Monumenta ad hist. Conc. Trid. spect., T. II., p. 98 sq.

[3] Against Luther's Discourse: On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church: Adsertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum, Londini, 1521.

Hosted by Google

minds with the momentous events just related, these acts produced little, if any, influence upon public opinion. To his royal opponents and the Universities, Luther replied in language of coarse vulgarity and abusive invective.[1] The admirable criticism of the heresiarch's teaching by *Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester, for the same reason, received but scant attention.[2]

Luther's Sojourn at Wartburg ("Patmos").

While Luther remained at the fortress of Wartburg, where, as it was paradoxically expressed, "he was a willing prisoner against his will," he was withdrawn from the baneful influence of Ulrich von Hutten, and might, with some effort, have been brought to think seriously upon his conduct, and view with some misgiving the terrible nature of the enterprise in which he was engaged. His bodily ailments and the stings of conscience not unfrequently drove him to the very brink of despair. Speaking of his feelings at this time, he says: "My heart beat with fear, and I asked myself the questions: Is wisdom thy exclusive gift? Are all others in error, and have they been so these many years? What if thou thyself art in error, leading others astray, to be damned eternally? By whom art thou commissioned to preach the Gospel, by whom called?" Luther failed to recognize these misgivings as Divine warnings; he regarded them as *assaults and temptations of the Devil, who*, he said, *well understood the art of frightening one by the remembrance of one's past sins.* He frequently had visions, in which demons flitted like specters across his heated imagination. The recital of them is frequently ludicrous and trifling, but they themselves play an important part in his life. By habitually yielding to their influence, he finally brought himself to indulge the pleasing delusion that the Catholic Church was the detestable kingdom of Antichrist, and the heritage of God's anger; that he himself was John the Evangelist banished by Domitian to the island of Patmos, a second Paul, or Isaias; and Melanchthon another Jeremias.

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, 1st ed., Vol. I., p. 109–110; 2d ed., p. 179–181.

[2] Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio. 1523. Conf. Dr. *Laemmer*, l. c., p. 14–20.

Hosted by Google

His trials, though numerous and severe, were wholly unproductive of good. While at Wartburg, he often indulged in the pleasures of the chase; but the bulk of his time was given to making *a translation of the Bible into German*, so worded as to fit his own system of belief.[1] He maintained an active correspondence with his friends, and continued to still exert, through his letters and other writings, the baneful influence which his presence had inspired. It was at this time that he wrote his inflammatory and mischievous pamphlets "*Against the Idol of Halle*" (the Archbishop of Mentz); "*On Monastic Vows;*" and "*On the Abuse of Masses*"—the first of which he dedicated to his father, and the last to the Augustinians of Wittenberg.[2]

§ 304. *Death of Leo X.—His Character.*

Laemmer, Monument. Vaticana, p. 3–10; for bibliography, see V. II., p. 922, n. 3. *Audin*, in his Life of Luther, ch. XVI., where he describes the court of Leo X. *Ranke*, Ecclesiastical and Political Hist. of the Popes in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, 4th ed., Brl. 1854, Vol. I., p. 80 sq. Engl. transl., Philad. 1841, 1844; New York, 1845; London, 1852. (TR.)

In putting an estimate upon the character of Leo X., determining the degree of authority he exercised, and the influence of his pontificate, it should be borne in mind that he abolished the Pragmatic Sanction in France;[3] brought the Lateran Council to a close (1517); and, through his representatives, Cajetan and Miltitz, set on foot negotiations in regard to Luther. Neither should his attitude toward the Emperor, Charles V., and his ambitious rival, Francis I., be overlooked. In his relations to these princes, he was bold, alert, and politic; now throwing the weight of his influence on the side of the one, and now of the other, as each in turn was superior in council or victorious in battle; always more intent on securing the possession of a province than in promoting the well-being of the Church. To artists and scholars he was magnanimous, noble, and generous; patronizing them, not from

[1] *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. III., p. 139 sq.
[2] *Riffel*, Vol. I., 2d ed., p. 329 sq.
[3] See Vol. II., p. 921.

Hosted by Google

feelings of vanity, but from taste and conviction, and as one having a practical and thorough knowledge of what he was doing, and why he did it. The age of Augustus seemed to have again dawned upon Rome. More devoted to art than to the duties of his offices—more enamored of the charms of elegant literature than of the chaste beauty of Christian virtue—Leo pursued toward Luther a policy at once halting and ineffective. Regarding religion himself as a matter of only secondary importance, he could but ill comprehend how others should bear trials for its sake, and expose themselves to countless dangers in pushing forward its interests. His pontificate, though one of the most brilliant, was by no means the most happy, in the history of the Church. His lavish extravagance occasioned in great part the disastrous controversies of the age, and was a source of no little embarrassment to his successors in the Papacy. He died December 1, 1521.

§ 305. *The Diet of Nürnberg convoked for September* 1, *and opened November*, 1522.

Raynald. Ann. ad an. 1522. *Menzel*, l. c., Pt. I., p. 105 sq. *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XV., p. 2504 sq. Correspondence of Pope Hadrian VI. with Erasmus (translated fr. the Latin), Frankfurt, 1849. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 378 sq.

The primary object this Diet had in view in assembling was to provide measures to repel a threatened invasion by the Turks. But as Luther had returned to Wittenberg (1522), *Hadrian VI.*,[1] formerly preceptor to Charles V. and now Pope, thinking the present occasion a favorable one for putting an end to the existing religious controversies, resolved to turn it to the best account. The character of Hadrian was quite the reverse of that of his predecessor, Leo X. Sincerely and deeply religious, a true priest, of simple tastes and grave manners, he had in a certain sense a horror of the art treasures of ancient Rome, regarding them as in a measure tending to revive the idols of Paganism. His dislike of them, which was emphatic

[1] *Hoefler*, Election and Accession of Pope Hadrian VI. to the Throne, Vienna, 1873; *Bauer*, Hadrian VI., being a picture of Life of the Age of the Reformation, Heidelberg, 1876.

Hosted by Google

and outspoken, gave great offense to the Romans, who, besides taking an enthusiastic pride in the reign of Leo X., had financial reasons for encouraging the love of pagan art which that reign had called forth. The oft-repeated words of Hadrian, that "he would have priests for the adornment of churches, not churches for the adornment of priests," expressed a line of action with which the Romans had little or no sympathy. The growing discontent reached its height when the Pope, through his legate, *Chieregati*, Bishop of Teramo, publicly proclaimed at the Diet of Nürnberg, that, "impelled alike by inclination and duty, he would put forth his best energies to bring about all needful reforms, beginning with the papal household, the primary source of the evils afflicting the Church, to the end, that, as corruption had infected high and low, all might mend their lives and make sure their salvation." But while thus frankly avowing the faults of the papacy, and promising the correction of these and other abuses, the Pope soon learned that it was not in his power to hasten the march of events, or to shorten the time necessary to such a work. Fully persuaded that only the ignorant could be led astray by the crude and irrational teachings of Luther,[1] and that the revolt against the old faith was to be mainly ascribed to the burdens and hardships endured by the bulk of the people, he entertained the hope that this frank avowal of the existence of evil and the promise of its correction, coming from the common father of Christendom, would have the effect of allaying popular discontent, of conciliating and inspiring confidence in the minds of all. In this frame of mind, he pressed the Diet to take prompt and vigorous

[1] In a letter written by him while yet a cardinal, he said, speaking of Luther: "Qui sane tam rudes et palpabiles haereses mihi prae se ferre videtur, ut ne discipulus quidem theologiae ac prima ejus limina ingressus ita labi merito potuisset. . . . Miror valde, quod homo, tam manifeste tamque pertinaciter in fide errans et suas haereses somniaque diffundens, impune errare et alios in perniciosissimos errores trahere impune sinitur." (*Burmanni* Analecta hist. de Hadr. VI., Traj. 1727, 4to., p. 447.) This judgment was based on the works of Luther published in Latin. His numerous works in *German* were still more calculated to lead minds astray and incite rebellion. (Vide supra, p. 30.) . . . Syntagma doctrinae theologicae Adriani VI., ed. *Reusens*, Lovanii, 1862; *ejusdem*, Anecdota de vita et scriptis Adriani, Lov. 1862.

Hosted by Google

measures against Luther; "for," said he, with prophetic foresight, "the revolt, now directed against the spiritual authority, will shortly deal a blow at the temporal also." The words of the Pontiff were ill-received by the Diet, and his warning unheeded; his frank avowal of the shortcomings of the papacy gave occasion to exhibitions of unseemly triumph, and his promise of reform was interpreted as an acceptance of defeat. The hundred and one grievances against the Holy See were again taken up; and the convocation of an ecumenical council, to convene in some city of Germany, imperiously demanded; which should, in the first instance, provide for the general well-being of the Church, and, this accomplished, settle the Lutheran controversy. Thus far, said the assembled States, it has been found impossible to enforce the edict placing Luther under ban of the Empire, from fear of a popular insurrection. However, they falteringly added, every effort will be put forth to prevent the propagation, either orally or in writing, of the new doctrines, until such time as the council shall have convened; and to sustain the authority of such bishops as shall punish married ecclesiastics with *canonical* penalties.

The Nuncio, clearly perceiving that the temper of the States was hostile to Rome, and mortified at the ill success of his mission, withdrew from the Diet; and Hadrian, equally cognizant of their sinister designs, gave expression to his sorrow in words of reproachful tenderness, in which, while laying bare the deep and intense grief that crushed his paternal heart,[1] he seemed to take upon himself the responsibility of all the faults committed by his predecessors. Hadrian, however, did more than utter words of complaint. Desirous of putting an end to the system of wasteful extravagance that had grown up under his predecessors, he dismissed a large number of useless functionaries, thereby exciting against himself a spirit of intense hostility. To add to the bitterness of his grief, he learned that his efforts to defend the island of Rhodes (December 25, 1522) against the assaults of the Turks, had proved unsuccess-

[1] Letters to the Elector of Saxony; to the cities of Breslau and Bamberg Conf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1523, nros. 73–86.

Hosted by Google

ful. The disastrous issue of all his most cherished projects was too much for the tender heart of the holy Pontiff, and he gradually sunk under the weight of accumulated sorrows. "How sad," said he in his last moments, "is the condition of a Pope who would do good, but can not." On the very day of his death (September 14, 1523), the Romans gave expression to unseemly joy, in a coarse inscription placed above the door of his attending physician.[1] He was entombed in *Santa Maria dell' Anima*, the national church of the Germans. At the right of the choir stands a noble sepulchral monument erected to his memory. It was executed by Michaelangelo of Siena and Nicolas Tribolo of Florence, after the designs of Badassare Peruzzi.

§ 306. *Efforts of Melanchthon and Luther to Spread the New Teachings.*

In 1521, after the close of the Diet of Worms, Melanchthon published his *Hypotyposes theologicae, seu Loci communes rerum theologicarum*, setting forth, with studious brevity and with great beauty of language, a full account of Luther's teachings.[2] He vehemently assailed the doctrine of human free-will, stating that "in spiritual affairs the intellect and reason of man are wholly in the dark" (*quod hominis intellectus ratioque in rebus spiritualibus prorsus est caeca*). "The adultery of David," said he, "and the betrayal of Judas are as much the work of God *as the calling of Paul.*"[3] Besides advocating

[1] Liberatori Patriae, S. P. Q. R.—The epitaph composed by his friends, and inscribed on his tomb, does him justice. "Here lies Hadrian VI., who held that to rule is the greatest of misfortunes." So also another, composed by a Hollander, and inscribed on his cenotaph: "Alas! how greatly are the efforts of the very best men colored by the character of their age." "Proh dolor, quantum refert in quae tempora vel optimi cujusque virtus incidat."

[2] Prima ed., Vit. 1521, 4to., and oftener; ed. *Augusti*, Lps. 1821.

[3] He says in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: "Haec sit certa sententia, a Deo fieri omnia, tam bona quam mala. Nos dicimus, non solum permittere Deum creaturis, ut operentur, sed ipsum omnia proprie agere, ut sicut fatentur, *proprium Dei opus fuisse Pauli vocationem*, ita fateantur, opera Dei propria esse, sive quae media vocantur, ut comedere, sive quae mala sunt, *ut Davidis adulterium;* constat enim Deum omnia facere, non permissive sed potenter, i. e. ut sit *ejus proprium opus Judae proditio, sicut Pauli vocatio.*"

Hosted by Google

predestination in the most extreme and rigid sense, he claims for man an individual and immediate inspiration. As Luther had formerly declaimed in the universities against the philosophy and methods of Aristotle, so Melanchthon now expressed a wish to see the works of Plato swept from the face of the earth. To carry out literally the words of Scripture, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," he bound himself as an apprentice to a master baker. Moreover, Melanchthon frequently expressed his hearty contempt of the very ablest ecclesiastical writers, of whom it would be small praise to say that they were preëminently his superiors in intellectual endowments and depth of thought.

Melanchthon opens his doctrinal exposition abruptly with predestination, and then goes on to discuss the other dogmas in dispute in a series of propositions, each independent of the other, and having no essential connection as integral parts of a consistent system. He even goes so far as to state that a Christian need know no more than the existence "of law, of grace, and of sin and its power for evil" (*vim peccati, legem, gratiam*). The doctrines of *free-will, grace, and predestination*, while playing so important a part in *the scheme of faith* and justification, are treated with special fullness. In subsequent editions of his work, he gave an exposition of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, professing to ground his statements on the utterances of the first six ecumenical councils.[1] Dr. Eck promptly published, as a reply to this work, his "*Enchiridion locorum communium.*"

As Melanchthon's doctrinal exposition had been addressed exclusively to the learned, Luther undertook to perform a similar work for the more illiterate, by translating, mostly from the original text, the New Testament into the vulgar

(*Chemnit.* loci theol., ed. *Leyser* 1615, Pt. I., p. 173.) In the later editions of Melanchthon's Commentary, this passage was omitted.

[1] Luther, writing of this work, says: "It is a charming and noble book, and deserves to live forever." And again: "Nothing better has been written since the days of the Apostles." Non solum immortalitate, sed etiam canone ecclesiastico dignum. On the other hand, *Strobel*, in his Literary History of Philip Melanchthon's Loci theologici (Altenburg and Nürnberg, 1776–1782), shows that this *dogmatical* work underwent subsequent variations, both as to *matter* and form.

Hosted by Google

tongue. This translation, before being published, was revised by himself and Melanchthon conjointly. Translations of the various books of the Old Testament, in which he also availed himself of the critical judgment of his friends, subsequently appeared.[1] Luther now had the effrontery to make the silly boast that he was the first to drag the Bible forth from beneath the dusty benches of the schools, an assumption which even Zwinglius some time later indignantly denied. "You are unjust," said he, "in putting forth this boastful claim; you forget that we have gained a knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures through the translations of others. To mention a few, there is *Erasmus* in our own day; *Valla*, a few years earlier; and the pious *Reuchlin* and *Pelican*, in the absence of whose labors, neither you nor others could have accomplished the great work. But I will be merciful, my dear Luther, although I should not; for the impudent boasting that pervades your books, your letters, and your discourses, merits the severest chastisement. You are very well aware, with all your blustering, that, previously to your time, there existed *a host* of scholars, who, in biblical knowledge and philological attainments, were incomparably your superiors."

Luther, in replying to those who objected that the indiscriminate reading of the Bible was dangerous, said: "Should any one attack you, saying: the Bible is obscure, or it should be read with the aid of the commentaries of the Fathers, you will reply: this is not true, for there never existed on earth a book more easily intelligible than the Bible."

[1] Last ed. with Luther's corrections, 1546. *Luther's* Sendbr. v. Dollmetshen der H. S. (*Walch*, Vol. XXI., p. 316 sq.) *Mathesius*, Thirteen Sermons.—*Panzer*, Hist. of Transl. of the Bible, Nürnberg (1783) 1791. *Marheinecke*, Services rendered to the cause of Religion by Translations of the Bible, 13 vl., 1815. *H. Schott*, Hist. of Transl. of the Bible, Lps. 1835. *G. W. Hopf*, Criticism of Luther's German Version of the Bible, Nürnberg, 1847. See *Audin*, Life of Luther, ch. XXIV. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

§ 307. *The Diet of Nürnberg.*

Laemmer, Monum. Vatic., p. 11 sq.—*Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. II., c. 10. *Raynald.*, ad an. 1524. *Ranke*, Roman Popes, Vol. I., p. 99–129.

Clement VII. (November 19, 1523–1534), the successor to Pope Hadrian, was a Humanist, and the friend of Erasmus. Prudent, considerate, and fair-minded, he exercised great circumspection in whatever he did, always weighing scrupulously every measure, in its various relations and adjuncts, before proceeding to act. This habit of caution drew upon him the imputation of acting, not as one who sees his way clearly before him, and then goes resolutely forward, but as one having an ulterior purpose in view, and making his approaches to it by a circuitous route.[1]

He was not long in making up his mind that the religious troubles in Germany demanded a prompt and vigorous treatment, and to this end he sent his legate, *Campeggio*, to the Diet of Nürnberg. When the papal legate had entered Germany, he became fully convinced, from the signs he saw about him on every side, that the people were hostile and evilly disposed toward the Pope. Arriving at the Diet, he was not a little surprised to find that Frederic, Elector of Saxony, the chief protector of Lutheranism, to whom he carried an affectionate letter from the Pope, and whom he had hoped to win back to the Catholic faith by his persuasive eloquence, was no longer there. The statement of the legate that the Pope regarded the "*Centum Gravamina*" as a fabrication of the enemies of the Holy See, rather than an honest expression of the true sentiments of the German people, produced a violent outburst of indignation from *the States present in the Diet.* The most the legate could obtain was a promise that, in the interval between the adjournment of the present and the assembling of the next Diet at Spire,[2] on the coming feast of St. Martin, the States *would do what they could* toward en-

[1] Cf. the character of Clement VII. as drawn by *Contarini* in *Ranke's* Suppl. to the Roman Popes, Vol. III., pp. 25, 26.

[2] The Recess of April 18, 1524, in *Lünig's* Archives of the Empire, P. gen. cont. I., p. 445. *Walch*, Vol. XV., p. 2674.

Hosted by Google

forcing the edict of Worms; would submit the Grievances against the Court of Rome to the judgment of certain wise and experienced men, and have them again examined and discussed at Spire; and that all magistrates would exert themselves to prevent the publication and distribution of writings injurious to the Holy See. The action of the States was equivocal and insulting, and called forth the indignant protest of Clement VII. They make a jest of the imperial authority, said he, and, in refusing to enforce the Edict of Worms, compromise the rights of the Emperor far more than the dignity of the Apostolic See.[1] The Emperor, viewing their action in the same light, commanded them to strictly enforce the Edict of Worms against Luther, the second Mohammed, under penalty of incurring the guilt of high treason, and being placed under the ban of the Empire. Although the action of the Diet was, for many reasons, offensive to both the Pope and the Emperor, it was hardly less so to Luther. His vanity was wounded, and he bitterly complained, that, after having undertaken an enterprise of unusual difficulty and danger, he now received only the reward of ingratitude for his pains. The opponents of Luther, now fully aroused and startled by the frightful consequences to which his teaching and revolt[2] would lead in practical life, prepared to take more decisive measures against him. The papal legate endeavored to adjust the differences between Austria and Bavaria, each suspicious of the ambitious designs of the other, and finally succeeded in effecting an alliance at Ratisbon (June 5, 1524) between the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria and the Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, to which twelve bishops of Southern Germany were also partners. The immediate object of this alliance was to protect the interests and institutions of the Catholic Church, and to enforce the edicts of Worms and Nürnberg. It was resolved that priests who should marry, should be canonically punished; that young Germans should be forbidden to make their studies at Wittenberg; and that a vigorous opposition should be made to

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1524, nro. 15 sq.

[2] See following paragraph.

Hosted by Google

whatever tended to propagate heresy. The opponents of Luther agreed upon a similar line of action at *Dessau*, in Northern Germany. On the other hand, the Landgrave, *Philip of Hesse*, drew to his party the new Elector of Saxony, *John the Constant* (May 5, 1525), whom he induced to sign a treaty of alliance, concluded at *Torgau*, May 4, 1526, by which the Protestant princes bound themselves to defend the principles and uphold the interests of Lutheranism in their respective States—*Mecklenburg*, *Anhalt*, *Mansfeld*, *Prussia;* and the cities of *Brunswick* and *Magdeburg* shortly after joined this alliance. In this way was the line of separation drawn between *Catholic* and *Protestant* Germany.[1]

If there was ever a time when it was to the interest of the Pope to closely ally himself to the Emperor, it was *now;* for Charles V., and he alone, was able and willing to maintain the Catholic Church in Germany. But unfortunately Clement failed to appreciate his opportunity, and imprudently published *a brief hostile to the interests of Charles*,[2] and entered into an alliance with Francis I. The consequences of his action were disastrous. The Emperor's forces besieged Rome on two different occasions, stormed and plundered the city, made the Pope prisoner, and offered many indignities to his person (May 6, 1527).

§ 308. *The New Teachings and Their Practical Consequences—Disorders at Wittenberg Caused by Carlstadt—The Anabaptists and the Peasants' War.*

The teachings of Luther soon found their way from his writings into the practical affairs of life. From his height at Wartburg, he flung down among the people his pamphlets on "*Monastic Vows*" and "*The Abuse of Masses.*"[3] *Bartholo-*

[1] The limits of the territory included by the Protestant and Catholic alliances may be seen in *Wedell's* Historical and Geographical Atlas, on map XVIII., b.

[2] See in *Raynald.* ad an. 1526, n. 6; also, a defense of the Emperor, in *Goldasti* Polit. Imp., Pt. XXII., pp. 990 sq.; also, a partial defense in *Raynald.*, l.c., n. 22.

[3] *Walch*, Vol. XIX., pp. 1304 sq. and 1808 sq.—Cf. *Riffel*, 1st ed., Vol. I., pp. 263–267; 2d ed., pp. 345–350. Luther said, in praise of the former of these two treatises, that, compared with the works he had hitherto written, it was (liber) "munitissimus et quod ausim gloriari invictus."

Hosted by Google

mew Bernhardi, a priest of the town of Kemberg, startled the world by openly taking a wife.[1] The Augustinian friars of Wittenberg, Luther's brothers in religion, declared their Vows and the Rules of their Order null and void. Luther had told them, in his pamphlet "*On Monastic Vows*," that such restrictions were contrary to the command of God; that monasticism itself was a revolt against Christ; and that, hence, monasteries should be burnt with fire, pitch, and brimstone, and utterly swept from the face of the earth, like Sodom and Gomorrah of old. At Wittenberg, Carlstadt, at the head of a fanatical mob, went about demolishing altars, overturning statues, and destroying pictures and sacred images; and, to put the crown on his sacrilegious conduct, administered the Lord's Supper to all who chose to approach, whether in the state of grace or not; and introduced the use of the German language in religious services.

Similar scenes were enacted at *Zwickau*, where *infant baptism* was rejected, on the ground that it had no more sanction in Holy Writ than other doctrines discarded by Luther on the same plea; for it is written, "Whosoever shall *believe* and be baptized, shall be saved." Hence, they said, as valid baptism could not be conferred until persons had attained the use of reason, it was plain adults should be *rebaptized*.

Nicholas Storch, a native of Zwickau, after gathering about him a number of immediate followers, consisting of twelve apostles and seventy disciples, proceeded with the former to Wittenberg, where he preached to the people, and proclaimed himself a prophet of God.

Melanchthon himself did not see his way clear out of the difficulties proposed by these "*visionary prophets*" against infant baptism, and for a time seemed to think that their doctrine, inasmuch as it had a Scripture sanction, might be conscientiously accepted. But some time after, disgusted with the excesses of the *Anabaptists*, he also rejected their teachings. His defection was, in part at least, compensated by the accession to their ranks of *Carlstadt*, *Martin Cellarius*,

[1] *J. G. Wolter*, Prima gloria Clerogamiae restitutae Luthero vindicata, Neostad. ad O. 1767, 4to.

Hosted by Google

a friend of Melanchthon's, the monk *Didymus*, and others. Didymus, in his sermons, warned parents against allowing their children to pursue profane studies; and Carlstadt, carrying his zeal against all human science still further, cast into the flames the text-books brought to him by students from all quarters, giving as his reason for so doing that henceforth the Bible alone should be read among men. Under pretext of following the precept of Our Lord in Matthew xi. 25: "I give thanks to Thee, O Father, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, *and hast revealed them to little ones*," he went through the streets of Wittenberg, Bible in hand, stopping the passers-by, and, entering the workshops, interrupted the artisans, to ask the meaning of difficult passages, as from persons whose minds had not yet been warped by the sophistry of science. The students passed beyond the control of the authorities, and it was feared the University would be closed. Even the heresiarchs were startled at the excesses to which their teachings had led, and began to grow uneasy, lest they might serve as a pretext to *Duke George of Saxony* for putting a stop to any further attempts at reforming the Church. Luther took alarm at the violence of Carlstadt's conduct, and wrote from Wartburg: "You have entered this conflict inconsiderately, and without method; you have thrown everything into confusion; your proceedings are without warrant or reason. I may as well let you know what I think of the business. I am disgusted. If affairs have a disastrous issue, I shall not answer for it. You have not sought my counsel before entering upon the undertaking, (?!) and you will now see to it that you get on *without me*. What has been done, has been ill done, though Carlstadt may affirm over and over that you are right in acting as you do."

In vain did Luther, at the instance of Melanchthon, write to them to prove the spirits before receiving their prophecies; the disorders went on. His friends wrote to him from Wittenberg, saying, "Come, or we perish." Frederic the Wise advised him not to leave Wartburg Castle. Luther left his Patmos March 8, and arrived at Wittenberg on Good Friday, 1522. Shortly before leaving Wart-

Hosted by Google

burg, Luther wrote to the Elector:[1] "Be it known to Your Highness that I go to Wittenberg under the protection of a providence stronger than that of princes and electors. I have no need of *your* support, but you have of mine; it will be of advantage to you," etc. Scarcely had he arrived at Wittenberg, when, ascending the pulpit, he began "to rap these visionaries on the snout." For eight days together, or during the whole of Easter-week, he declaimed, in a series of masterly discourses, against those fanatical leaders and barbarous iconoclasts. "*All violent and untimely measures*," said he, "*employed to hasten the moment for a clearer understanding of religion, are equally opposed to the Gospel and to Christian charity. External changes in ecclesiastical affairs should be introduced only after men's minds have been convinced of the necessity of such changes.*"

Luther was now in a position to see the practical workings of his own teaching and the faithful reproduction of his own conduct, and for the moment he seemed startled by the vision. But rapidly recovering himself, he again dashed headlong into just such violent and revolutionary conduct as he had attempted to suppress, again declaiming like a maniac against religious vows.[2] "It is all one," said he, with shameless effrontery, "whether one says to God: I promise never to leave off offending Thee; or whether one says: I promise to live always chaste and poor that I may lead a just and holy life. The day has come," he continued, "not only to abolish forever those unnatural vows, but to punish, with all the rigor of the law, such as make them; to destroy convents, abbeys, priories, and monasteries, and in this way prevent them ever again being uttered."

Luther's words found a responsive echo in the hearts of the depraved. Troops of monks deserted their convents, took wives, and became ardent Lutherans. It was soon plain to Luther that these reprobate monks, acting from carnal and lustful impulses, "singularly corrupted the good odor of the

[1] *De Wette*, Luther's Letters, Vol. II., p. 137 sq.

[2] Short Epilogue against Vows and Religious Life in Monasteries, in *Walch*, Vol. XIX., p. 797.

Hosted by Google

Gospel." The spirit of revolt once evoked brooks no control. Luther himself rode the crest of the wave. Like Carlstadt, his former master, he gathered all his strength for an effort to abolish the Mass. To him *the ever-renewing Sacrifice* was a horror. "*Your only purpose in retaining the Mass*," said he reproachfully to the Collegiate Chapter of Wittenberg, which had resisted his appeals, "*is to have always at hand a convenient pretext for starting new sects and opening fresh schisms.*" The impious rage of his adherents outran his own. "These priests, these mumblers of Masses," they cried out in their impotent fury, "deserve death quite as richly as the profane blasphemers who curse God and His Saints on the public thoroughfares." By the use of violent means like these did Luther finally succeed in abolishing the Canon of the Mass (November, 1525); he retained only the Elevation.

The influence of Luther's works, and particularly of those written in the vernacular, was not confined to priests and monks alone; it extended to the bulk of the people as well. Borne down by the weight of political oppression, they listened with feelings of enthusiastic and fanatical approbation to the ideas of Gospel freedom, so glowingly set forth by the new preachers. "I behold them coming from these sermons," said *Erasmus*, "with threatening looks, and eyes darting fire, as men carried beyond themselves by the fiery discourses to which they have just listened. These followers of the Gospel are ever ready for a conflict of some kind; whether with polemical or martial weapons, it matters little."

Luther called upon the people to cast off the yoke laid upon them by the priests and monks. Following his advice, the peasants refused to pay the customary taxes to bishops and monasteries. They interpreted Gospel freedom to mean a sanction authorizing them to disregard whatever was disagreeable or irksome, and to rebel against princes, particularly such as remained faithful to the Church. These they were taught to look upon as tyrants and enemies to Gospel truth.

While Luther's work on "*Christian Liberty*," which had been scattered throughout the whole of Germany, prepared the way for revolt, his treatise on "*The Secular Magistracy*" (1523) formally advocated the abolition of all authority what-

Hosted by Google

ever, whether ecclesiastical or political.[1] The peasantry, *inflamed by the fanatical teachings and fiery appeals of the sectaries, rather than driven to excess by the tyranny and extortions of feudal lords*, rose in open and organized rebellion. In a manifesto, consisting of twelve articles,[2] based upon texts drawn from the writings of Luther, the peasants claimed, first of all, the right of appointing and removing at will their ministers of the Gospel. The insurrection rapidly spread over *Suabia*, the *Black Forest*, the *Palatinate*, *Franconia*, *Thuringia*, and *Saxony*. The peasants, assembling in large bodies, would proceed to plunder and burn convents, demolish the strongholds of the nobility, and commit every sort of outrage and atrocity.

Thomas Münzer, the leader of the sect of "*Conquering Anabaptists*" in Thuringia, preached a doctrine of political equality and freedom far more comprehensible to the illiterate peasantry than the religious equality and freedom advocated by Luther.

After being driven out of Altstadt, where he had incited the citizens to rebel against the civil magistrates by his revolutionary harangues, and had put himself at the head of mobs that went about demolishing Catholic chapels and overturning Catholic altars, he received an appointment as pastor in the town of Mühlhausen. Here again he headed a formidable insurrection against the civil authorities; styled himself a prophet, and signed himself "Münzer, the bearer of the sword of Gideon;" proclaimed the natural equality of all men, a community of goods, the abolition of every sort of authority, and the establishment of a new "*Kingdom of God*," composed solely of the just.

Everywhere illiterate peasants might be seen taking upon themselves the office of preaching, for they had been told that

[1] The following extract from this treatise will indicate its drift: "Should some one say: Since (according to Luther) there is to be no sword among Christians, how are they to be made responsible for their external acts? Surely there must be some representative of sovereign authority among them. Answer such one that *no sovereign authority should exist among Christians;* each should be subject to the other, according to the words of Paul, Rom. xii.: 'In honor preventing one another;' and again: I. Peter ii.: 'Be ye subject to every human creature;' 'honor all men.'"

[2] Cf. *Alfred Stern*, Concerning the Twelve Articles of the Suabian Peasants.

Hosted by Google

any one might announce the word of God. They besought Luther, now that he had, by the weapon of Holy Scripture, set at defiance every human power and authority, to undertake the defense of their cause. Luther was at first extremely embarrassed by this appeal, but finally sent them an answer in the form of an *exhortation*, addressed alike to princes and peasants, whom he styled respectively "My dear Sirs and Brothers." With his accustomed dishonesty and dexterity, he shifted the responsibility of the peasants' insurrection, from where it properly belonged, to the bishops and Catholic princes,[1] "*who*," he said, "*never wearied of crying out against the Gospel.*" As might have been foreseen, his exhortation was without effect. The peasants grew daily more bold and insolent, and their devastations and enormities more atrocious. At Weinsberg, they forced seventy knights to commit suicide, by throwing themselves against spears held before them. When Luther's enemies sarcastically taunted him with being an accomplished hand at kindling a conflagration, but an indifferent one at putting out the flames, he published a pamphlet against "*those pillaging and murdering peasants.*" "Strike," said he to the princes, "strike, slay, front and rear; nothing is more devilish than sedition; it is a mad dog that bites you if you do not destroy it. There must be no sleep, no patience, no mercy; they are the children of the devil." Such was his speech in assailing those poor, deluded peasants, who had

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 5 sq.; Vol. XXI., p. 149; concerning various districts of the country of *Baden*, see *Mone*, Sources of the History of Baden, Carlsruhe, 1848 sq., Vol. II., 4to. *Sartorius*, Essay of a Hist. of the "Peasants' War," Berlin, 1795. *Wachsmuth*, "The Peasants' War," Lps. 1834. *Zimmermann*, A General Hist. of the Great Peasants' War, Stuttg. 1843, 3 vols. *Bensen*, Hist. of the Peasants' War in East Franconia, written from the sources, Erlangen, 1840. *Cornelius*, Studies on the Hist. of the Peasants' War, Munich, 1862; *Schreiber*, The Peasants' War in Germany, Freiburg, 1864. *Jörg*, Germany during the Revolutionary Period from 1522–1526, Freiburg, 1851. Cf. also the following Essays: Causes of the Peasants' War in Germany (Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. VI., p. 321 sq.); The Breaking out of the Peasants' War, its character, and the actors therein (l. c., p. 449–409); Defensive operations against the Peasants (ibid., p. 627–644); Manifestoes and Scheme of Constitution of the Peasants (ibid., p. 641–664); Bearing of Luther during the Peasants' War (l. c., Vol. VII., p. 170–192); see also *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 412–479; 2d ed., Vol. I., p. 508–581.

Hosted by Google

done no more than practically carry out his own principles. They were to be subdued by the strong hand of authority, and to receive no sympathy, no mercy, from their victorious conquerors. It is computed that a hundred thousand men fell in battle during the Peasants' War, and of this immense loss of life Luther took the responsibility. "I, Martin Luther," said he, "have shed the blood of the rebellious peasants; for I commanded them to be killed. Their blood is indeed upon my head; but," he blasphemously added, "*I put it upon the Lord God, by whose command I spoke.*"[1]

Melanchthon's connection with the Peasants' War is still more strange. Although more discreet and temperate than Luther, it is nevertheless undeniable that the benignant mildness popularly ascribed to him had in it a large admixture of violent passion and vindictive rancor, and he was therefore not long in following in the footsteps of his master. Replying to Prince Louis, Count Palatine of the Rhine, who, being desirous to prevent the further effusion of the blood of his people and to restore order, had asked his opinion as a theologian on the peasants' manifesto of the Twelve Articles (1525), he said that "it was his *settled conviction* that the Germans had been granted a great deal more freedom than was beneficial to people so rude and uncultured."[2] He also taught that the just rights of the peasantry might be legally violated. "As governments can do no wrong," said he, "they may confiscate the communal lands and forests, and no one has a right to complain; they may confiscate the wealth of churches, and apply it to secular uses, and no resistance should be made. The Germans should submit to the grievance as did the Jews of old when the Romans plundered their temple." "Thus," says *Bensen*,[3] "while the Catholic Church has never sanctioned, at least in theory, the oppression practiced by prelates and nobles, and has ever defended—sometimes successfully, but always obstinately—the rights of individuals

[1] Luther's Table-Talk, Eisleben ed., p. 276. Cf. †**Friedrich*, Astrology and the Reformation; or, the Astrologers as the Preachers of the Reformation and Authors of the Peasants' War, Munich, 1864.

[2] *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 371 sq.

[3] l. c., § 19.

Hosted by Google

and nations against even Emperors themselves; the evangelical reformers are justly reproached with having been the first to teach and to preach the doctrine of servile submission and the right of the stronger to the Germans." By the advice of Luther and Melanchthon, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse; Henry, Duke of Brunswick; and George, Duke of Saxony, took the field against the peasants, and very nearly annihilated their numerous army at the battle of Mühlhausen, fought May 15, 1525.

Münzer was taken prisoner, and, after submitting to a wearisome investigation and enduring painful torture, was beheaded. In the presence of death, and when about to meet his God, he abjured his errors, and professed that he wished to die an obedient and repentant son of the Church he had so often and so violently outraged. He besought the *princes* to deal clemently and mercifully with the peasants, and exhorted *these* to render a proper obedience to constituted authorities.[1]

Luther was now the object of universal execration; for while the principles set forth in his works openly favored revolt, and tended to stir up sedition, he had counseled princes[2] to destroy with fire and sword poor peasants who were only carrying out in practice what he advocated in theory. Of the thirty articles, in which the peasants set forth their grievances, some were copied literally from his German writings, and demanded exemption from all taxes, the abolition of the seigneurial courts, the discontinuance of the payment of tithes and other dues, and the right of every parish to appoint and remove their ministers at will; while the twenty-eighth avowed open hostility to all his adversaries.

[1] *Seidemann*, Thomas Münzer, being a biography written from the sources found in the State Archives of the Kingdom of Saxony, Dresden and Lps. 1842. Cf. Hist. and Polit. Papers, art. "*Thomas Münzer*," Vol. VII., p. 238–256; 310–320. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 479–522; 2d ed., p. 581–632. *Schmidt*, Justus Menius, the Reformer of Thuringia, Lps. 1867.

[2] *Thomas Münzer* had already violently assailed Luther, in replying to the harsh language employed by the latter against the peasants. He styled him "an ambitious and deceitful scribbler, a proud fool, a shameless monk, a doctor of lies, an accomplished buffoon, the Pope of Wittenberg, the impious and carnal man of Wittenberg," etc.

Hosted by Google

Even Erasmus rebuked Luther for the course he had pursued. "We are now gathering," said he, "the fruits of your teaching. You say indeed that the word of God should, of its nature, bear very different fruit. Well, in my opinion, that greatly depends on the manner in which it is preached. You disclaim any connection with the insurgents, while *they regard you* as their parent, and the author and expounder of their principles. It is notorious that persons who have God's word constantly in their mouth, have stirred up the most frightful insurrections." Neither should it be forgotten that, even as early as the year 1522, Luther wrote exultingly to his friend Link, at Wittenberg: "The people are everywhere rising; *their eyes are at length opened;* they will no longer suffer themselves to be cruelly oppressed." In 1526, Luther's tone had changed; he was no longer, what he first proclaimed himself, the champion of the people; from this time forth he was the apologist of power, and *the friend and counselor of princes.*

§ 309. *Henry VIII., King of England, and Erasmus Oppose Luther—Marriage of Luther.*

Cf. **Kerker*, Erasmus and his Theological Point of View (Tübingen Theological Quart. Review, 1859, n. 7).

Henry VIII., King of England, formally ranged himself among the enemies of Luther. He was irritated and alarmed by the reformer's revolutionary schemes, as set forth in "*The Captivity of the Church in Babylon.*" Among other startling assertions, it was there stated that the Papacy, far from being of Divine origin, was an anomaly in church government, and an insufferable usurpation; that it had distorted many of the truths of primitive revelation, and had been instrumental in reducing the Church to the condition of captivity, in which the Daughter of Sion now mourned. Henry, first of all, addressed a letter to the Emperor and to Louis the Elector Palatine, dated May, 1521, requesting them to silence Luther, and eradicate his teaching.[1] The crowned theologian,

[1] *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. XIX., p. 153 sq.

Hosted by Google

who, had his brother Arthur lived, might have filled one of the archiepiscopal sees of England, entered a little later on the *field of polemics* against the Saxon monk. Closeted with his chancellor, the Archbishop of York; with Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and other prelates,[1] he wrote the "*Defense of the Seven Sacraments against Doctor Martin Luther*," in which he triumphantly refuted every false statement and defective argument of his adversary. Following the line of reasoning pursued in a former age by Tertullian, he demonstrated that papal authority and the power of the keys had been, at all times and everywhere, recognized by Christians; defended the Mass as the great central act of Christian worship, and established its character as a sacrifice; and, going through the list of the reformer's errors, gave complete and irrefragable answers to them all. Toward the close of the Defense, Henry sums up Luther's character. "This petty doctor," says he, "this grotesque saint, this pretender to learning,[2] in the pride of his self-constituted authority, spurns the most venerable doctors the world has known, the most exalted saints, and the most distinguished biblical scholars." "What profit," he presently continues, "can come of a contest with Luther, who is of nobody's opinion, who does not understand himself, who denies what he has once affirmed, and affirms what he has already denied? He is a shameless scribbler, who sets himself above all laws, despises our venerable teachers, and, in the fullness of his pride, ridicules the learning of the age; who insults the majesty of pontiffs, outrages traditions, dogmas, manners, canons, faith, and the Church herself, which, he professes, exists nowhere outside of two or three innovators, of whom he has constituted himself the leader."[3] But Henry was not content to use invincible reasoning alone; he had recourse to wit, sarcasm, and such popular arguments as would place the contradictions of his adversary in the fullest light. His

[1] *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1854, Vol. II., p. 50. (Tr.)

[2] Doctorculus, sanctulus, eruditulus.

[3] Adsertio VII. Sacram. adv. Luther., Lond. 1521, pp. 97, 98. *Walch*, Vol. XIX., p. 158. See above, p. 42, note 2. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 342-371; 2d ed., p. 433 sq., where is likewise described Luther's attitude over against Duke George of Saxony.

Hosted by Google

brilliant polemics won for him from Pope Clement the title of "*Defender of the Faith*" (*Defensor Fidei*), a distinction which placed him on a plane with the great Catholic sovereigns of Europe, and which he had long desired to possess. It should be remarked that the "*Defense*" of the royal theologian, although possessing considerable merit, was vastly overrated by the King's admirers, who politely assured him that it was quite equal to anything St. Augustine had written.

Luther was prompt with his reply. He styled himself "Luther, by the grace of God, *Ecclesiastes* of Wittenberg." The production is a model of vulgarity and indecency.[1] Henry did not pursue further this method of warfare; he had recourse to diplomacy, where he hoped to be more successful.

In the sequel of his controversy with the royal champion, whose political influence proved more efficient than his theological learning, Luther showed himself to be the most vile of hypocrites. Perceiving that a rupture was imminent between Henry VIII. and the Holy See, and desirous to secure the good offices of that prince in a conflict against a common enemy, he addressed him a letter couched in words of fulsome adulation, and conveying an apology for former insults. But Henry was not so easily mollified; a remembrance of unforgiven wrongs still dwelt in his memory, and he took advantage of this opportunity to publicly expose the duplicity of Luther, and to hold him up to the sneers and derision of the world.[2]

The distinguished scholar, *Erasmus*, had early excited the indignation of the monks by his sarcastic flings at their shortcomings, and by his unsparing freedom in criticising the existing ecclesiastical abuses. Indulging the hope that Luther's efforts might prove effectual in bringing about a reform in

[1] Luther called Henry "a crowned ass, a liar, a varlet, an idiot, a sniveling sophist, a swine of the Thomist herd. Courage, you swine; burn me if you dare. Henry and the Pope," he said, "are equally legitimate; the Pope has stolen his tiara, and the King of England his crown, which accounts for their rubbing each other like two mules. Thou art a blasphemer, not a king; thou hast a royal jawbone, nothing more; Henry, thou art a fool," etc.

[2] *De Wette*, Vol. III., p. 23 sq. *Walch*, Vol. XIX., p. 468 sq. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 355; 2d ed., p. 446 sq.

Hosted by Google

the Church, he had, like George Wicel, Cochlaeus, Willibald Pirkheimer, and Ulric Zasius, at first expressed sympathy with the reformer,[1] and insisted on giving him a trial before condemning him. Luther, on his part, was anxious to secure the friendship of Erasmus, and took occasion to inform him that he had a high esteem of his character, and regarded him as "the glory and hope of Germany, and a man of transcendent learning and genius." But Erasmus and his friends, perceiving that Luther's policy retarded, instead of accelerating, true reform; exposed the truth, which, it was said, would be purified of all error, to the wranglings of an ignorant multitude;[2] and everywhere encouraged disorder and tumult, threatening schism in the Church and anarchy in the Empire, instantly took alarm, and severed their connection with the party of the reformer. The apprehensions of Erasmus were all the more keen and intense, inasmuch as he was fully capable of appreciating the splendid talents of Luther. "*Would to God*," he wrote to Duke George of Saxony, "*that there was less merit in the writings of Luther, or that they were not so utterly marred by his extreme malice.*"

There was a general wish to see Erasmus take part in the controversy, as every one knew the weight his name and influence would carry with them. Princes and prelates, and even Pope Hadrian,[3] besought him to come forth from his peaceful retirement, to give over for a time the pleasures and attractions of literary pursuits, and take up the defense of the Church. He reluctantly yielded, but not until he could no longer decently hold back. He began by showing the untenableness of the underlying principles of Lutheranism—"not," says a Protestant writer,[4] "as a blind defender of the Roman Court, nor as one having a superstitious reverence for

[1] *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 1–186.

[2] The opinion of Erasmus is given in his "De amicabili Ecclesiae concordia." Cf. *Esch* on Erasmus (Raumer's Hist. Manual for 1843).

[3] Epist. Erasmi, Ep. 639. Sentiments of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Cologne, 1688, pp. 26, 27. *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1854, Vol. II., c. IV. (Tr.)

[4] *Planck*, History of Protestant Dogmatics, Vol. II., p. 112.—Cf. especially the points of comparison as drawn by *Zasius*, a contemporary of the reformers, and to be found in *Döllinger*, Hist. of the Ref., Vol. I., p. 177–179.—*Riffel*, Vol II., p. 251–298.

Hosted by Google

consecrated prejudices, nor yet as a personal enemy of Luther's, but as a peaceful opponent of his opinions, and as one who states his doubts and puts forth his views with the modesty of a scholar and the dignity of an independent thinker." In the first place, he showed that Luther, in quoting Scripture against free-will, had done so to no purpose, and then proceeded to establish the doctrine from the very same source.[1] Luther made haste to reply, and employed against his antagonist all the brutal ribaldry that characterized his answer to Henry VIII.[2] This vaunted champion of intellectual freedom comes forward and says boldly, that *human will is a slave*, doing what it does at the bidding of a master. This, he says, is its characteristic since the fall, and to leave no doubt as to his meaning, he compares it now to Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt; now to the trunk of a tree; and, again, to a shapeless block of stone, which sees not, hears not, and has lost all sense of feeling.[3] He advocates and defends the following propositions, asserting a fatalism more in harmony with the degrading teachings of the Koran than the Divine truth of the Gospel, which Mr. *Lessing* has characterized as more bestial than human, and nothing short of a frightful blasphemy.[4] Man, says Luther, is like a horse. "Does God leap into the saddle? The horse is obedient, and accommodates itself to every movement of the rider, and goes whither he wills it. Does God throw down the reins? Then Satan leaps upon the back of the animal, which bends, goes, and submits to the spurs and caprices of its new rider. The will can not

[1] De libero arbitrio diatribe, 1524, written with much care, yet *wanting in the dogmatic precision* so conspicuously absent from all the author's works (*Walch*, Vol. XVIII., pp. 19, 62).

[2] Luther calls *Erasmus* a Pyrrhonian, an *unbeliever*, and a disciple of *Lucian*, a blasphemer and an atheist, having within him a sow of the Epicurean herd.

[3] De servo arbitrio ad Erasm., 1525 (*Walch*, Vol. XVIII., pp. 20, 50). Luther's work on Slave-Will went through ten editions. *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1854, Vol. II., ch. VII.

[4] *Lessing* puts these words into the mouth of a Lutheran: "Speak not to me of free-will; I am an honest Lutheran, and will persist in holding that *man is destitute of free-will*, though the error be bestial rather than human, and have the character of a blasphemy." (On the Doctrine of Spinoza.)

Hosted by Google

choose its rider, and can not kick against the spur that pricks it. It must get on, and its very docility is a disobedience or a sin. The only struggle possible is between the two riders, God and the Devil, who dispute the momentary possession of the steed. And then is fulfilled the saying of the Psalmist: 'I am become like a beast of burden.'" "Let the Christian then know," he continues, "that God foresees nothing contingently; but that he foresees, proposes, and acts from His eternal and immutable will. This is the thunderbolt that shatters and destroys free-will. Hence it comes to pass, that whatever happens, happens according to the irreversible decrees of God. Therefore necessity, not free-will, is the controlling principle of our conduct. God is the author of what is evil in us, as well as of what is good; and as He bestows happiness on those who merit it not, so also does He damn others who do not deserve their fate."[1]

The groundwork of Luther's whole system, as Plank very justly observes, is the assumed slavery of the human will, and we find him writing to Capito, in 1537: "Let all my writings perish, if only my work 'On Slave-Will' and my catechisms be preserved." Even the "*Formula Concordiae*," or book of Lutheran symbols of faith, gives Luther the same distinction. "Luther," it says, "has given a solid and beautiful explanation of this subject (human will) in his work On Slave-Will." "*Hoc negotium in libro de servo arbitrio . . . egregie et solide explicuit.*"

This champion of *free-inquiry* was obliged to go whither the logical deductions of his system would lead him, and he did not halt at difficulties. There were Scripture texts plainly against his theory of the inherent slavery of the human will; but even these he set aside by an *ipse-dixit*, distorting them from their natural sense and obvious meaning, by blasphemously asserting that God, when inspiring the passages in question, was playfully mendacious, secretly meaning just the reverse of what He openly revealed; and that the Apostles, when speaking of human will and *actions*, gave way to

[1] Lutheri opera Latina, Jenae, T. III., fols. 170, 171, 177, 207. Witt. Germ. fols., 534 b, 535 a. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

an impulse of unseemly levity, and used words in an *ironical sense.*[1]

The quiet of Erasmus' life was again broken in upon. Luther's bold assertion and defiant defense of error again called forth the powers of his intellect and the resources of his learning. He wrote a *second work* against the heresiarch, entitled the "*Hyperaspistes,*"[2] in which, with more severity of tone and incisive brilliancy of style than he had formerly employed, he mercilessly exposed the willful ignorance of Luther and his criminal waywardness. The latter, deeming it imprudent to provoke further discussion, addressed a letter to Erasmus, artfully flattering the scholar, and feigning sorrow for having gone beyond the limits of polemical courtesy. The flattering letter has been lost, and the character of its contents is known only from the reply of Erasmus.[3] Erasmus had not been more brutally treated than others. Luther's language to the Bishop of Meissen, as well as to *Emser* and Doctor *Eck*, and to the theological faculties of *Louvain* and *Paris*,[4] had been equally violent and abusive; and as we shall see further on, when we come to speak of his disputation with Carlstadt on the Lord's Supper, he did not forget his art as time went on.

In the midst of these conflicts, and while the disastrous War of the Peasants was still going on, Luther, now grown corpulent and rubicund, threw off the monastic habit (December, 1524), and a few months later (June 13, 1525) married Catharine Bora, to the great astonishment of his friends, whom he had not apprised of his intention. Catharine had been a nun in the Cistercian convent of Nimptschen, near

[1] "To do," said Luther, "*means to believe—to keep* the law *by faith.* The passage in Matthew, 'Do this and thou shalt live,' signifies: *Believe this* and thou shalt live. The words '*Do this*' have an ironical sense, as if Our Lord would say: Thou wilt do it to-morrow, but not to-day; only make an attempt to keep the commandments, and the trial will teach thee the ignominy of thy failure." *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. VIII., p. 2147.

[2] *Hyperaspistes*, diatr. adv. servum arb. Luth., Pt. II., p. 526 sq. (Opp. ed. Cleric., T. X., p. 1249). Cf. on this controversy, *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 250–298.

[3] Epp. (ed. Cleric.) XXI., 28: "Optarem tibi (Luth.) meliorem mentem, nisi tua tibi tam valde placeret. Mihi optabis quod voles, modo ne tuam mentem, nisi Dominus istam mutaverit."

[4] Conf. *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 108–111.

Hosted by Google

Grimma, in Saxony, afterward broken up; but tiring of a religious life, into which she had been reluctantly forced by her parents, she invoked the good offices of Luther, who sent *Bernard Köppe*, a citizen of Torgau, to her relief. This young man one night forced the doors of the convent, secured Catharine, who, by preconcerted arrangement, was expecting him, and hurried her away to Wittenberg.[1] She is described as disagreeable, imperious, and haughty, "but as much beloved by Luther as the Epistle to the Galatians, and more acceptable to him than the possession of the Kingdom of France or the Republic of Venice." This step was thought hasty and inconsiderate by his friends; and even Melanchthon, in a letter to Camerarius, confesses that the announcement of the event surprised and disquieted him not a little. Luther's enemies had a hearty laugh. "It was thought," said Erasmus, "that Luther was the hero of a tragedy; but, for my own part, I regard him as playing the chief character in a comedy, which has ended, as every comedy ends, in a marriage." Luther himself said he took the step "to *encourage* the Cardinal Elector of Mentz, cousin to the apostate Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, who could hardly hesitate to follow *so illustrious an example.*"

§ 310. *Organization of the Lutheran Church in Hesse and Saxony.*

Riffel, Vol. II., p. 1–126, where this subject is exhaustively treated.

As time went on, it became quite clear, from the character and scope of the questions discussed by the sectaries, that a deadly blow was being aimed, not only at the dogmatic teaching and internal constitution of the Church, but at her external organization as well. Luther had already made some progress in this direction, and while he had succeeded in abolishing episcopal jurisdiction in countries where the principles

[1] *Engelhard*, Lucifer Wittebergensis; or, the Morning Star, i. e. Complete Life of Catharine von Bora, Landshut, 1749, 2 vols. *Walch*, Catharine von Bore, Halle, 1751, 2 vols. *Beste*, Catharine von Bora, Halle, 1843. *Meurer*, Catharine Luther, Dresden, 1854. Cf. the exceedingly beautiful and touching remark on this event, by *Surius*, ad an. 1525. Cf. Defense of *Simon Lemnius*, by *Lessing*, in his seventh and eighth letters (Complete Works of Literature and Theology, Carlsruhe edit., Pt. IV., p. 29–37).

Hosted by Google

of the Reformation had taken root, he had as yet failed to put any other form of ecclesiastical government in its place. The question then naturally arose as to the character and limits of the jurisdiction to be exercised by ecclesiastical superiors. Luther wished *Canon Law*[1] swept from the face of the earth, and, in his intemperate zeal and fanatical haste to do away with it forever, had pitched a copy of it into the flames, together with the papal bull of excommunication. By this act, he drew upon himself the violent hostility of the "*Jurists*," who taunted him with introducing novel and exceptionably *lax principles on marriage*,[2] which they held to be the *sacred bond* alike of the family and the State, but which he denied to be in any sense a sacrament, and regarded as simply an affair of expediency and business, falling within the same category as eating and drinking, buying and selling. To provide a remedy for these difficulties, *Philip*, the young *Landgrave of Hesse*, Luther's most zealous partisan since the death of the Elector, Frederic the Wise of Saxony, convoked a synod to convene at *Homburg*, in October, 1526. The leading spirit in this synod was the apostate Minorite monk, *Lambert of Avignon* († 1530), who, in a very eloquent speech, recommended the adoption of a synodal constitution, based upon

[1] His saying was: *Purus canonista est magnus asinista.*

[2] See his famous "*Sermon on Marriage*" (1526), in the Jena ed., Pt. II., fol. 151, where the following passages are found. (The requirements of our language will not admit of a translation.) (Tr.). "Quid," he asks, "si mulieri ad rem aptae contingat maritus impotens?" And he replies: "Ecce, mi marite, debitam mihi benevolentiam praestare non potes, meque et inutile corpus decepisti. Fave, quaeso, ut cum fratre tuo aut proxime tibi sanguine juncto occultum matrimonium paciscar, sic ut nomen habeas, ne res tuae in alienos perveniant.

"Perrexi porro maritum debere in ea re assentire uxori, eique debitam benevolentiam spemque sobolis eo pacto reddere. Quod si renuat, ipsa clandestina fuga saluti suae consulat et in aliam profecta terram, alii etiam nubat."

And again (fols. 156, 168): "If the wife refuse, call in the serving-maid. . . . If she, too, refuse the marriage-duty, send her away, and in the room of Vashti put Esther, after the example of King Ahasuerus."

Luther was still more indulgent to princes. See *Walch*, Luther's Works, Pt. XXII., p. 1726. Cf. *Luther's* Marriage-code, particularly where he treats of the *objects* of matrimony and the *impediments to divorce* (Histor. Polit. Papers, Vol. XI., p. 410–435).—*Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. II., pp. 427 sq. and 623 sq.

Hosted by Google

democratic principles, and granting to each congregation full control of its own ecclesiastical discipline. As the Landgrave plainly saw that this plan would secure him pecuniary advantages and great political influence, he did not hesitate to adopt it; and as it had among its advocates, besides the eloquent Minorite, *Adam Krafft*, the court-chaplain, he at once gave orders to have it carried into effect.[1]

John the Constant, the new Elector of Saxony, while fully in sympathy with the Lutheran movement, was less prompt in action than Philip of Hesse. In consequence, the pastors throughout his dominions took the initiative, and requested him to introduce for the government of the various churches a system similar to that already adopted in Hesse. He at length consented to introduce the system of *Parochial Visitation* suggested by Luther. Melanchthon embodied the main features of this plan in a *Formulary, or Book of Visitation*,[2] containing a short Confession of the Evangelical faith. In this way, the several churches, though each was independent of all the others, preserved a sort of outward uniformity. The Elector appointed a commission, consisting of laymen and ecclesiastics, by whom preachers were set over the various parishes, and the ancient ecclesiastical foundations abolished. In 1527 and 1528, a visitation of the various churches was made by a commission of four, composed of *theologians* and *jurists*. Officers, called *Superintendents*, exercised a general supervision over all ecclesiastical affairs, and decided matrimonial cases; but the *reigning prince* was *ex officio* the *supreme* authority in whatever related to church government.

In the course of the visitation of 1527 and 1528, Luther discovered that both clergy and people had but scant religious information, and fully alive to the paramount importance of instructing the young as a means of giving stability and permanence to his work, without which all others would be

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 76–126, On the Introduction of the New Doctrines into Hesse. *Hassenkamp*, Ch. H. of Hesse from the Reform., Marburg, 1853.

[2] Instruction for the Parochial Visitors (Lat. 1527), with Luther's preface, Wittenberg, 1528, 4to. German and Latin edit., by *Strobel*, Altdorf, 1777. Edited, with a hist. introd. and explanatory notes, by *Weber*, *Schlüchtern*, 1844. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 52–61.

Hosted by Google

futile, he published in 1529 two *catechisms, a larger* and *a smaller*, written in clear, plain language, intelligible alike to old and young.[1]

Such was the origin of the *collegiate* and *territorial* ecclesiastical organization of Saxony, which replaced the ancient hierarchical and papal government, and became the model for the Lutheran churches of every other country. These changes were greatly accelerated by the irresolute and vacillating policy pursued by the Diets of which we are about to speak, and henceforth princes favorably disposed to Lutheranism might have no fear of following their inclinations, or giving the most practical expression to their sympathies.

§ 311. *Diets of Spire* (1526, 1529).

According to the agreement entered into by the Catholic and Protestant princes[2] at the Diet of Nürenberg, the States assembled at Spire in 1526.[3] The Emperor was engaged in a harassing and protracted war, and the Archduke Ferdinand was wholly occupied in repelling the advance of the Turks, who were seriously threatening Hungary. The Lutheran princes were in consequence bold and defiant, and seemed to have been more or less influenced by the impious assertion of Luther, that "*to fight against the Turks is to resist God, whose instruments they are in chastising our iniquities.*" When they appeared at the Diet, they showed the complete and thorough discipline of an organized religious party, were exacting in their demands, and menacing in their speech and conduct. Under the circumstances, they had matters pretty much their own way, and extorted from the Diet the following concessions: "1. Until such time as an ecumenical council should convene, each State was at liberty to act in regard to the Edict of Worms as in its judgment seemed best, and to be responsible for such action to God and the Emperor. 2. Each prince was bound to furnish aid against the Turks

[1] *Walch*, Vol. X., p. 2 sq. Cf. *Augusti*, Hist. and Critical Introduct. to the two great catechisms, Elberfeld, 1824.

[2] See § 307.

[3] *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 350 sq.

Hosted by Google

at the earliest possible moment."[1] The latter provision came too late. *Louis, King of Hungary*, had been defeated by Soliman, near Mohacz, August 29, 1526, and perished in the morasses. His crown was inherited by the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria.

The Lutheran princes, regardless of the engagements entered into in this Diet, began immediately to make preparations for an aggressive war, from which both Luther and Melanchthon attempted in vain to dissuade them, by telling them that "the word of God and His work were their own defense, and stood in no need of human aid; they were strong enough of themselves to repel every assault of their enemies." The Lutheran princes, however, became daily more and more settled in their determination to take up arms; but, as if their own resolution were not sufficient to drive them forward, it received a fresh and violent impulse from another quarter. *Otho von Pack*, the wicked and unscrupulous chancellor of Duke George of Saxony, sent a forged document to the Landgrave of Hesse, purporting to be a copy of an alliance entered into at Breslau by his master with Ferdinand of Austria and the German bishops for the subjugation of the Lutheran princes, and the division of their States among the conquerors. That the instrument was a fabrication, was plain enough; but there were not wanting evilly-disposed persons to give currency and credit to its contents, and Luther was especially rejoiced at the opportunity it afforded him of damaging in the public estimation the character of Duke George, whom he regarded as his personal enemy.[2] In the course of a correspondence carried on some time later between the Landgrave of Hesse and his father-in-law, Duke George of Saxony, the former admitted that he had been practiced upon; but the admission came too late to correct the evil—the story had gone abroad and done its work, in widening and deepening the breach between the two parties. This was evident when, in 1529, the States of the Empire again con-

[1] *Sletdan.*, lib. VI.; *Kapp*, Gleanings, etc., Pt. II., p. 680; *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 214.

[2] Cf. the detailed account of *Riffel*, Vol. I., p. 371–376, note 1; Vol. II., p. 356 sq.

Hosted by Google

vened at Spire, for the double purpose of adjusting religious difficulties and providing measures against the Turks,[1] who had already advanced in formidable numbers as far as Vienna, and were repulsed only by the heroism of the garrison and the gallantry of the citizens of the German capital. The Lutheran princes were accompanied to the Diet by their own chaplains, and each celebrated divine worship after his own fashion. The Catholic princes submitted as the basis of settlement very fair and moderate propositions, being substantially the same as the articles accepted by both parties three years before. These stipulated that "the Edict of Worms should be maintained in the States in which it had been already received, but that the others might retain the new doctrines until the assembling of an ecumenical council, because it would be dangerous to abolish them; that in the meantime no one should be permitted to preach against the Sacrament of the Altar; that the Mass should not be abolished where it was still celebrated, and, where it had been already abolished, no one should be molested for hearing or celebrating it in private; and, finally, that the ministers of the Church should preach the Gospel according to the Church's received interpretation, and should carefully avoid touching controverted questions, concerning which the decision of the council should be awaited."

These propositions were certainly just and conciliatory, but the Lutheran princes thought otherwise, and on April 19, 1529, they solemnly protested against them, whence their name, *Protestants*, which they have ever since retained, and their only bond of unity from that day to this has been a common protest against the Catholic Church. *Claiming to be the exclusive heirs of the true religion, and the only members of the one saving Church of Christ, they maintained that the Mass, being plainly from the words of Holy Writ an idolatrous act of worship, could not, and ought not, be tolerated.*[2] They, more-

[1] See the Acts in *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 328–429.

[2] It was to show how "un-Catholic is such unity against the Catholic Church, and to expose the spirit of disunion among Protestants themselves," that *Weislinger* wrote his "*Friss Vogel oder stirb*," i. e. "*Neck or Nothing*," Strasburg, 1726. It is not likely these gentlemen were so oppressed with scruples of con-

Hosted by Google

over, sent a copy of their protest to the Emperor, who was then at Bologna. Charles V., having conquered France and Italy, concluded peace with Pope Clement VII., June 20, 1529, at *Barcelona*, and shortly after, at *Cambrai*, with Francis I. On the 24th of the following February, he received the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope, at Bologna. As has been stated, the Lutheran princes, some time previous to this event, sent their protest to Charles, who stated, in reply, that "the Catholics were quite as little disposed as the Protestants to act against their consciences and their faith, and longed quite as ardently as they for the convening of an ecumenical council, which, they had every reason to hope, would be a source of glory to God, of peace to Christian princes, and of every manner of good to Christendom; but," he said in conclusion, "until such time as the council should convene, he wished the Protestant States to strictly enforce the decisions of the Diet." The deputies, having formally protested against the Emperor's action, were by his order cast into prison, whence they were shortly after released. On the 21st of January, 1530, the Emperor convoked another Diet, to convene at Augsburg, at which he promised to be present in person, and give a hearing to both parties, and expressed the hope that all would lay aside controversial rancor and bitterness, and unite their efforts for the common weal of Christendom.

Owing to the unusual outburst of violence which accompanied *the renewal of the controversy on the Lord's Supper*, the condition of the Protestants grew daily more critical. The wide divergence of opinion on this question between Luther and Zwinglius was prominently brought out in the *Seventeen Articles*, so called, of *Schwabach* and *Torgau*, embodying the teaching of the former.[1] *Philip*, Landgrave of Hesse, dreading fresh disturbances among his own people, *arranged for a conference at Marburg* (October 1, 1529) between the two champions, which, to his great disappointment, instead of bringing

science as they would have us believe, for they protested against the decision of the Diet of Spire, in 1526, prohibiting the dissemination of the teachings of the Sacramentarians, whom Luther now pronounced the greatest of scourges, and persecuted accordingly.

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 375 sq.

Hosted by Google

them nearer to each other, drove them farther asunder. "You do not at least refuse to regard us as brethren," said Zwinglius at the close of the disputation, "for we desire to die in the communion of Wittenberg?" "No, no," replied Luther; "cursed be such an alliance; begone, you are possessed of another spirit than ours."[1] "The Zwinglians," he added, "are a set of diabolical fanatics; they have a legion of devils in their hearts, and are wholly in their power."[2] After these outbursts, Luther said, in a spirit of considerate forbearance, that he still retained for them feelings of Christian charity, which, he explained, he entertained toward all men!

Melanchthon now felt that he had committed a blunder in opposing, at the Diet of Spire, the measures directed against the Sacramentarians, and bitterly regretted his folly. The conviction was strong upon him that he had, by his conduct on that occasion, contributed not a little toward the dissemination of the errors of Zwinglius.

§ 312. *Diet of Augsburg*, 1530—*Religious Peace of Nürnberg*, 1532.

Walch, Vol. XVI., p. 374 sq. *Förstemann*, Documents supplementary toward the Hist. of the Diet of Augsburg, Halle, 1834 sq., 2 vols. *Coelestini*, Hist. comitiorum Augustae celebratorum, Francofurti ad Viadrum, (1577) 1597. *Chytraeus*, Hist. of the Confession of Augsburg, Rostock, 1576. *Salig*, Hist. of the Augsburg Confession, Halle, 1733 sq., 3 Pts.; the same ed. by *Pfaff*, Stuttg. 1830; by *Fickenscher*, Nürnberg, 1830. *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. III., cap. 3. Cf. *Hase*, Libri symbolici Evangelicorum, Lps. 1837. *Menzel*, loco cit., Vol. I., p. 335 sq. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 378–441, on the Diet of Augsburg, and p. 442–519, on the Protestant League and the religious peace of Nürnberg.

The Emperor did not arrive at Augsburg until the 15th of June. The following day, being the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament, was the occasion of fresh difficulties, as the Protestant princes peremptorily refused to join the procession, which always takes place on that day, or in any way to participate in the religious ceremonies. The Emperor requested the Protestant princes to lay before him a written confession of their faith and an enumeration of the abuses which they

[1] *Erasmi* Ep. ad Cochlaeum. (Tr.)

[2] *Schmitt*, The Religious Conference at Marburg, Marburg, 1840.

Hosted by Google

refused to accept. The preparation of the document was committed to Melanchthon, who, following the Seventeen Articles of Schwabach or Torgau as his guide and basis, composed what has since been known as the Augsburg Confession, or Symbol of Faith (*Confessio Augustana*).[1] Luther gave it his fullest approval. "I am quite pleased," he says, "with the document; I see nothing in it that requires either changing or mending. I could not myself have written it, having neither the sweetness of temper nor self-restraint necessary to the task." It consisted of an introduction, or preamble, and *two* parts—the first being an exposition of what its authors *believed*, in *twenty-one articles*, based upon the Apostolic and Nicene Symbols; and the second, an enumeration of the so-called *abuses*, in seven articles.[2] Among the

[1] While the Diet was still in session, this Confession went through many editions, and each contained fresh alterations, of which Melanchthon knew nothing. In 1530, he published a new edition of it, adding a preface, in which he says: "*Nunc emittimus probe et diligenter descriptam confessionem ex exemplari bonae fidei;*" and in the following year he added a *defense* of it. A new edition of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 was published at Leipsig in 1845.

Shortly after the Diet, Melanchthon began to make some alterations and recast the expressions, and in 1540 published a new edition under the title of *Confessio variata*, containing important changes and additions, chiefly in reference to the Lord's Supper, with a view to harmonize the teachings of the Lutherans and Calvinists. These alterations were subsequently the occasion of no little controversy, inasmuch as they were repudiated by the orthodox Lutherans, who refused to depart from the doctrine of the *Invariata Confessio Augustana*, while the reformed party held with equal tenacity to the *Confessio variata*. It is by no means certain that the Confession generally accepted by Lutherans is identical with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, for the copies found in the various archives are at variance with each other, and the original Latin and German copies laid before the Diet have been either lost, or slumber in the library of either Rome or Madrid. Cf. *Hase*, Libri symbol., varietas variatae confessionis, in Prolegom., P. XII.–LXI.

[2] Not twelve articles, as the French translator of Alzog, and Abbé Darras, who copied from him, erroneously state. The twenty-one articles are: 1. Of God; 2. Of Original Sin; 3. Of the Son of God; 4. Of Justification; 5. Of Preaching; 6. Of New Obedience; 7 and 8. Of the Church; 9. Of Baptism; 10. Of the Lord's Supper; 11. Of Confession; 12. Of Penance; 13. Of the Use of Sacraments; 14. Of Church Government; 15. Of Church Order; 16. Of Secular Government; 17. Of Christ's Second Coming to Judgment; 18. Of Free-Will; 19. Of the Cause of Sin; 20. Of Faith and Good Works; 21. Of the Worship of Saints. The second and more practical part, which is carried out at greater length, contains seven articles on disputed points: 22. On the Two

Hosted by Google

abuses were included *Communion under one kind, private Masses, the celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, the distinction of meats for days of abstinence, auricular confession, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy as a system of church government.* The first part, which contained Luther's doctrines clothed in graceful, conciliating, and insidious language,[1] was carefully and artfully written, the object being to give the least possible prominence to distinctively Lutheran principles, and the greatest to points held in common by Catholics and Protestants. But with all his care and skill, Melanchthon could not clothe error in the vesture of truth; the heresies of the Saxon monk could not be concealed, the chief of which were the following: 1. That *original sin* has wholly incapacitated man for doing good; 2. That *justification* depends on *faith alone;* 3. That "*free-will* is to be acknowledged in all men who have the use of reason; not, however, in affairs relating to God, which can be neither begun nor completed without Him; but only in affairs relating to the present life and the duties of civil society."[2] As regards *faith and good works*, the teaching

Kinds of the Sacrament; 23. Of the Marriage of Priests; 24. Of the Mass. 25. Of Confession; 26. Of Distinctions of Meat; 27. Of Conventual Vows; 28. Of the Authority of Bishops. *Chambers'* Cyclop., art. "Augsburg Confession." (Tr.)

[1] As is well known, the utterances of Luther in regard to *faith*, made both at an earlier and a later period of his life (see p. 27), are insanely blasphemous. In the course of a letter, written to Melanchthon from the Castle of Wartburg, in 1521, he says: "Esto peccator et pecca fortiter; sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo, qui victor est peccati, mortis et mundi: peccandum est, quamdiu hic sumus.... Sufficit quod agnovimus per divitias gloriae Dei agnum, qui tollit peccata mundi, ab hoc non avellet nos peccatum, etiamsi millies uno die fornicemus aut occidamus." (Lutheri epp. a Joan. Aurifabro coll., Jen. 1556, 4to., T. I., p. 545.) The *Confess. Augustan.*, artic. IV., de *justificatione*, on the other hand, says: "Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum *per fidem*, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit." (*Hase*, l. c., p. 10.) According to this passage, faith appears to be the *fastigium;* whilst, according to the Catholic idea, it is the *initium, radix, fundamentum* omnis justificationis. Justification, according to Lutheran doctrine, *covers* sin; God simply *declares man just.* According to Catholic doctrine, justification *is worked out*, since its conditions are *abolitio peccati* and *renovatio seu sanctificatio interioris hominis.*

[2] *Audin*, Life of Luther, London, 1857, Vol. II., p. 334. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

and practice of the Catholic Church were grossly misrepresented; for, it was said, whereas, on the one hand, her members were not heretofore required to have faith; on the other, they were obliged to perform all sorts of external works of piety, such as reciting beads, making pilgrimages, and the like; 4. That the *Church*, properly defined, is the assembly of the saints, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the Sacraments (of which five were thoughtfully abolished by the saints) are rightly administered; 5. That the *confession of mortal sins to a priest* is not necessary or obligatory; and that absolution consists in declaring sins remitted, though they are not in fact so remitted; 6. That the *veneration and invocation of Saints* are unlawful practices, and must be discarded; 7. And, finally, that *transubstantiation* does not take place *in the Sacrament of the Altar.*

A difficulty now arose as to the public reading of the Confession in the Diet. The Protestant princes, who had severally signed it, contended against the Catholic princes, that, in fairness, it should be read; and, against the Emperor, that, if read at all, it should be read *in German*, and not in Latin. They were successful in both instances, and the Confession was publicly read in German by *Bayer*, one of the two chancellors of the Elector of Saxony, during the afternoon session of June 25, held in the chapel of the imperial palace. *Campeggio*, the Papal Legate, was absent. The reading occupied two hours, and the powerful effect it produced was, in a large measure, due to the rich, sonorous voice of Bayer, and to his distinct articulation and the musical cadence of his periods. Having finished, he handed the Confession to the Emperor, who submitted it for examination to *Eck*, *Conrad Wimpina*, *Cochlaeus*, *John Faber*,[1] and others of the Catholic theologians present in the Diet. They not only pointed out the errors it contained, but showed, by placing passages of it beside extracts taken from the writings of Luther, that it did not fairly represent his teachings; that it concealed, under an insidious and graceful phraseology, those most offensive to Catholic

[1] Faber was a Dominican, and at this time first Vicar General of the Bishop of Constance, Provost of Ofen, and Court-chaplain to King Ferdinand.

Hosted by Google

ears, and gave marked prominence to those against which no exception could be taken. Of course, the Catholic theologians, in replying to the Confession, could not be wholly unmindful of the disasters which the principles of the Reformers had already brought upon Germany, or entirely divest themselves of the bitter feelings of indignation which in consequence naturally filled their minds. These feelings, in a measure, found expression in their answer, which, besides being occasionally intemperate, was severely caustic and ironical, and on this account not quite acceptable to the Emperor and the Catholic princes, who advised that the matter be again taken under consideration, and a fresh answer prepared. After the first fire of indignation had burnt out, the Catholic theologians, returning to a better sense, saw the need of keeping their temper, and the prudence of observing in their answer a strictly judicial calm. Under the influence of these convictions, they again set themselves to the work of examining the Confession. Each article was singly taken up, discussed, and analyzed, according to the rigorous rules of logic, and then a dispassionate judgment as to its merits or demerits was passed. Luther's teachings were examined in the light of Catholic tradition, and it was shown in what they harmonized with Catholic faith, and where and how far they diverged from it. Such was the character of the *Confutation of the Augsburg Confession* (*Confutatio Confessionis Augustanae*) as finally agreed upon, and read in a public session of the Diet, held August 3d, and with which the Emperor and the Catholic princes expressed themselves fully satisfied. The Protestant princes were commanded to disclaim their errors, and return to the allegiance of the ancient faith, and "should you refuse," the Emperor added, "we shall regard it a conscientious duty to proceed as our coronation oath and our office of protector of Holy Church require."[1] This declaration

[1] These two writings, in Latin and German, have been published and reviewed in "*The Catholic*," 1828 and 1829; also in Lat. and Germ., with an Introd. by Canon *Kieser* of the Chapter of Freiburg, Ratisbon, 1845. Cf. *Laemmer*, Ante-Tridentine Theology, p. 43 sq. †*Interim*, The Diet of Augsburg, 1530, and the sentiments expressed by William, Duke of Bavaria, and Stadion, Bishop of Augsburg, concerning the Lutheran Confession, Düsseldorf, 1844. The former

Hosted by Google

roused the indignant displeasure of the Protestant princes. Philip of Hesse, dissatisfied with the vacillating timidity of Melanchthon, excited general alarm by abruptly breaking off the transactions, lately entered upon between the princes and the bishops, and suddenly quitting Augsburg. Charles V. now ordered the controverted points to be discussed in his presence, and appointed seven Protestants and an equal number of Catholics to put forward and defend the views of their respective parties. Of these seven, three were theologians, two princes, and two jurists. On the Catholic side, the theologians were *Eck*, *Wimpina*, and *Cochlaeus;* the princes. *Stadion*, Prince-bishop of Augsburg, and *Henry*, Duke of Brunswick; the jurists, *Bernard Hagen*, chancellor to the Archbishop of Cologne, and *Jerome Vehus*, the chancellor of Baden: on the Protestant side, the jurists were *Dr. George Brück* and *Dr. Sebastian Haller*, the former chancellor to the Elector of Saxony, and the latter to the Margrave of Brandenburg; the princes, *John Frederic*, crown-prince of Saxony, and *George*, Margrave of Brandenburg; the theologians, *Melanchthon*,[1] *Brenz*, preacher of Hall, in Suabia, and *Schnepf*, court-chaplain to the Landgrave of Hesse. These theological commissions came to a satisfactory understanding with each other on the questions of *original sin*, *justification*, *the constituent parts of penance*, *the Lord's Supper*, and *the veneration of the Saints*. A select commission was next appointed, consisting of Eck and Melanchthon and four jurists, two for each party, who took up the discussion of Communion under both kinds. The Catholic theologians promised to obtain for Germany the same concessions that had been granted to the Hussites, provided the other points in dispute could be adjusted to the satisfac-

is represented as having said: "If I correctly understand the issues, the Lutherans stand firmly *upon* the Scriptures, and we by the *side* of them;" and the latter as having solemnly declared, that "all that had been read before them (i. e. Augsburg Confession) was pure and undeniable truth;" but be this as it may, it is quite certain that *George*, the Protestant Duke of Brandenburg, having openly affirmed, after the reading of the Confession, that he would willingly have his head struck off in defense of it, the Emperor replied with his usual composure: "*No head! no head!*"

[1] *Spiecker*, Melanchthon at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530 (Review of Positive Theology, 1845, Pt. I., p. 98 sq.)

Hosted by Google

tion of all. Apart from the Mass, celibacy, and episcopal jurisdiction, on which both parties were in hopeless disagreement, there remained still other differences, the settlement of which, even if it had been effected, could not have been other than momentary and illusory. If the importance of unity could be overrated, it would be difficult to understand why the Catholic theologians put forth so great efforts to secure it; the more so, since its realization seemed next to impossible, inasmuch as the principles from which each party started were as completely opposed to each other as light is to darkness. "For," as *Pallavicini* forcibly observes, "Catholic faith rests upon a principle one and indivisible, viz: *the authority of the infallible Church;* to make the smallest concession here would be to surrender the whole ground: what is one and indivisible stands as a whole, or falls as a whole." But these considerations, though an inseparable obstacle to any concessions on the part of Catholics, had no similar import or force with Protestants, who daily yielded one point after another, thus conclusively demonstrating that the immutable dogmas of faith were after all but a trifling matter to them, and by no means the primary cause of their revolt.

Melanchthon was not unwilling to have even *episcopal rights and prerogatives* retained. "How," said he, "shall we dare be so bold as to deprive bishops of their authority, if only they continue to teach sound doctrine? Will you have me speak out my mind? Well, then, I should like to give them back their episcopal power and spiritual administration. Were the Church destitute of a governing power," he candidly confesses, "we should languish under a tyranny, compared with which that of which we are just rid would be more tolerable."

In a letter bearing the date of July 6, and addressed to *Campeggio*, the Papal Legate, he is still more outspoken, expressing his wish to have the Roman Pontiff retain his office of Head of the Church, which he continued to do—not, however, from a desire to comply with Melanchthon's request. "We have no doctrine," says this reformer in a candid mood, "other than that of the Roman Church. If she consent to dispense to us those treasures of good-will, of which she is so

Hosted by Google

lavish to her other children, and to overlook certain matters of trivial importance, and avert her eyes from others—which, though we should wish it ever so sincerely, can not now be changed or mended—we will yield her a prompt and ready obedience. We hold in honor the Pope of Rome and the whole constitution of the Church, and are prepared to cast ourselves at the feet of the Roman Pontiff once we have the assurance that he will not repel us. Why should he refuse to hear our suppliant prayer, when unity may be so easily restored? The obstacles in the way of a sincere reconciliation are only differences of opinion, so trifling that even the canons do not require complete harmony as a condition of unity with the Church."[1] These pacific words startled the friends of Melanchthon, and the cities, prominent in their advocacy of Lutheranism, and notably Nürnberg, addressed him words of stinging rebuke, of which he bitterly complained. "You can hardly imagine," he wrote to Luther, "how odious my efforts to restore jurisdiction to bishops have rendered me to the people of Nürnberg and many others."[2] "*Their disposition to find fault*," he added, "*plainly shows that they are more intent on gaining their private ends, than on securing the success of the Gospel.*"

Luther, being under ban of the Empire, could not participate in the Diet of Augsburg, and in consequence took up his residence at Coburg, where he was within convenient distance to be consulted on any important matter that came up, and to encourage his disciples when their spirit failed them. Displeased at the course pursued by Melanchthon, he sharply reproved him, saying: "I will hear of no attempt to bring about unity of doctrine, inasmuch as such unity is impossible until the Pope consent to put away the surroundings

[1] Melanchthon's ep. ad Camerarium, pp. 148 and 151. Cf. *Coelest.* Hist. August. Confess., T. III., fol. 18, in the resumé of *Raynald.* ad an. 1530, nro. 83. *Pallavicini*, l. c., lib. III., c. 3.

[2] *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XVI., p. 1793. Cf. with this letter of Sept. 1st that of August 28th, *ibid.*, p. 1755: "The imperial cities are violently incensed against episcopal authority. It would seem that their one aim is to be despotic in governing and licentious in morals, they take so little account of religion or its teachings."

Hosted by Google

of the papacy. You will bring disaster upon the whole business by your ceaseless quibbling and interminable concessions. These Catholics adroitly spread snares for our feet, which we must watchfully avoid."[1]

Had Melanchthon been as honest as he was sincere in his convictions, and as courageous as he was timid, he might at this time have broken once for all with Protestantism; but being under the powerful influence of Luther's superior mind, he ignobly consented to do as the latter bade him. So, instead of following up and pressing his efforts to bring about a reconciliation, he prepared and published his "*Apology for the Augsburg Confession*," which was intended to be an answer to the *Confutation* of the Catholic theologians. The Protestant princes laid a copy of the "Apology" before the Emperor, who rejected both it and the Confession; but by many of the Protestants the former was held to be of equal authority with the latter. On the other hand, the four cities specially attached to the teachings of Zwinglius—viz: *Strasburg*, *Constance*, *Lindau*, and *Memmingen*—produced a confession of faith, known as the "*Confessio Tetrapolitana*," embodying their special tenets; while *Zwinglius* produced another of his own, giving special prominence to the points on which his opinions were in conflict with those of Luther on the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon was so utterly amazed at the boldness of Zwinglius in daring to exercise the common right of all reformers, that, in writing to one of his friends, he accounted for it by saying that "*he had certainly gone mad.*"

[1] In this letter, which bears the date of August 28 (*de Wette*, Vol. IV., p. 156), he uses the strange language, underscored in the following passage, which has been so frequently quoted against him: "Ego in tam crassis insidiis forte nimis securus sum, sciens, vos nihil posse ibi committere, nisi forte peccatum in personas nostras, ut perfidi et inconstantes arguamur. Sed quid postea? Causa et constantia et veritate facile corrigatur. Quamquam nolim hoc contingere, tamen sic loquor, ut si qua contingeret, non esset desperandum. *Nam si vim evaserimus, pace obtenta, dolus* (*mendacia*) *ac lapsus nostros facile emendabimus*, quoniam regnat super nos misericordia ejus." The word *mendacia* is found in *Chytraeus* (born February 26, 1530), Hist. Aug. Conf., Francof. 1578, p. 295; *Coelestini* Hist., loco cit., T. II., fol. 24. But *Veesenmeyer*, in his Review of Luther's Letters, attacks it, p. 31, and *Gieseler* rejects it altogether (Text-book of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. 1, p. 265). (*Doller*) Luther's Catholic Monument, Frankfurt, 1817, p. 309 sq. See *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 422 sq.

Hosted by Google

After many more equally fruitless attempts to bring about a reconciliation, the Emperor, on the 22d of September, the day previous to that fixed for the departure of the Elector of Saxony, published an edict, in which he stated, among other things, that "the Protestants have been refuted by sound and irrefragable arguments drawn from Holy Scripture." "To deny free-will," he went on to say, "and to affirm that faith without works avails for man's salvation, is to assert what is absurdly erroneous; for, as we very well know from past experience, were such doctrines to prevail, all true morality would perish from the earth. But that the Protestants may have sufficient time to consider their future course of action, we grant them from this to the 15th of April of next year for consideration."

On the following day, *Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg*, speaking in the Emperor's name, addressed the Evangelic princes and deputies of the Protestant cities[1] as follows: "His Majesty is extremely amazed at your persisting in the assertion that your doctrines are based on Holy Scripture. Were your assertion true, then would it follow that His Majesty's ancestors, including so many Kings and Emperors, as well as the ancestors of the Elector of Saxony, were heretics! There is no warrant in the Gospels, or elsewhere in Holy Scripture, imposing the obligation of seizing another's goods, and sanctioning their retention, on the plea that they can not, consistently with the dictates of conscience, be given up. . . . The Emperor also has a conscience, and, in our opinion, is far less inclined to deviate from the teachings of Christ's Holy Church and her venerable and ancient faith, than the Elector of Saxony and his allies."[2]

The Protestant princes forthwith took their leave of the Emperor.

On the 13th of October, the "Recess," or decree of the Diet, was read to the Catholic States, which on the same day entered

[1] The princes were the Elector of Saxony and five others in alliance with him; and the six cities were Nürnberg, Reutlingen, Kempten, Heilbronn, Windsheim, and Weissenburg. (Corp. Ref. II., p. 474–478.) (Tr.)

[2] See the powerful speech delivered in the name of the Emperor by the ardent Catholic, *Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg*, in *Menzel*, Vol. I., p. 406.

Hosted by Google

into a Catholic League.[1] On the 17th of the same month, sixteen of the more important German cities refused to aid the Emperor in repelling the Turks, on the ground that peace had not yet been secured to Germany.[2] The Zwinglian and Lutheran cities were daily becoming more sympathetic and cordial in their relations to each other.[3] Charles V. informed the Holy See, October 23, of his intention of drawing the sword in defense of the faith. The "Recess" was read to the Protestant princes November 11, and rejected by them on the day following,[4] and the deputies of Hesse and Saxony took their departure immediately after. On the 19th of November, it was again read in presence of the Emperor, and the princes and deputies still present in Augsburg. The decree was rather more severe than the Protestants had anticipated, inasmuch as the Emperor declared that he felt it to be his conscientious duty to defend the ancient faith, and that "the Catholic princes had promised to aid him to the full extent of their power." The "Recess" was made public November 22, and two days after the Emperor set out for Cologne, having wholly failed to accomplish the object of his visit. The failure was mainly to be ascribed to the conflicting interests of the Catholic and Protestant princes; for while the former, dreading the consequences of a civil war, neglected to second the Emperor's efforts in any efficient way, the latter had to be conciliated if their aid was to be secured in prosecuting a war against the Turks, whose aggressive movements were at this time filling Europe with fear and alarm. The appointment of the Emperor's brother, Ferdinand, as King of the Romans (1531), gave deep offense to the Protestant princes, who now expressed their determination of withholding all assistance from the Emperor until the "Recess" of Augsburg should have been revoked.

Assembling at *Smalkald* on Christmas Day, 1530, they entered into an alliance offensive and defensive, known as the League of Smalkald, on March 29, 1531, to which they sev-

[1] *Documents* II., p. 737–740. (Tr.)
[2] *Corp. Ref.* II., pp. 411, 416. (Tr.)
[3] *Documents* II., p. 728. (Tr.)
[4] *Documents* II., p. 823; *Corp. Ref.* II., p. 437. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

erally bound themselves to remain faithful for a period of six years. They were still further encouraged to go boldly forward in their new course by the advice of Luther and Melanchthon, who, reversing their former judgment, now authorized *the use of arms for the maintenance of Protestantism.* The Turkish sultan became now, in a measure, the natural ally of the Protestant princes; for, being himself desirous of profiting by the divisions in Germany, he encouraged those who were the cause of them to hold out against the Emperor. Perhaps the most offensive and burthensome clause of the "Recess" of the Diet was that *requiring the Protestants to restore the Church property of which they had taken possession,* and placing those who refused compliance under the ban of the Empire.

The danger from the threatened invasion of the Turks becoming daily more imminent, the Emperor saw the necessity of concluding peace—on favorable terms, if possible; otherwise, on the best he could extort. For this purpose, he opened negotiations at Frankfurt, which, through the efforts of the Elector of Mentz and the Elector Palatine, were brought to a conclusion at Nürnberg, July 23, 1532. It was here agreed that, until the assembling of a general council, no action should be taken against any of the princes; that in the interval everything should remain unchanged; that both parties should cease to carry on religious hostilities; and, finally, that those only *who had already received the Confession of Augsburg* should be included in the treaty of peace. The Protestant princes, acting on the suggestion of Luther and Melanchthon, urgently demanded the insertion of the last clause; and the latter at the time expressed themselves fully content with what they had gained.

As the Turks continued to advance on Europe, the consternation caused by their progress afforded the Protestant princes an opportunity to still further strengthen themselves, by forming new alliances against the Emperor, and they were not slow to make the best of their advantages. *Philip of Hesse* opened negotiations with Francis I., King of France. Ulric, Duke of Würtemberg, who had been placed under the ban of the Empire, and whose states had been transferred to Ferdi-

Hosted by Google

nand, having joined the Protestant League, was forcibly reinstated in his duchy by Philip of Hesse. *John Brenz* and *Erhard Schnepf* gave form and organization to Protestantism in Würtemberg, where it had been propagated by the apostate monk, *John Mantel*, assisted by *Conrad Sam*, of Rotenacker, and others.[1] Negotiations were also opened with the Swiss, and as the perfidious and pliant *Bucer* was ever ready to accommodate himself to circumstances, and to sacrifice his religious convictions to his sordid interests, a union was concluded between the Swiss Church and the Lutheran princes, although against Luther's own wish and advice (1538). While agreeing, or professing to be in agreement in matters of doctrine, they allowed every one to interpret the formula of consecration in the Lord's Supper according to his private judgment, a principle which has the unusual merit of securing unity of belief, by granting a general permission to all to believe and to disbelieve what they like.

§ 313. *Ulrich Zwingli and Œcolampadius.*

Zwinglii Opera, ed. *Gualther*, Tig. (1545), 1581, 4 vol. in fol.; ed. *Schuler* et *Schulthess*, Tig. 1829–42; eight Pts., in 11 vols. (prima ed. completa). German edition by the *same* editors, Zürich, 1828 sq. Corpus libror. symbolicor., qui in eccl. *Reformatorum* auctoritatem publicam obtinuerunt, ed. *Augusti*, Elberfeld, 1827. Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicat., ed. A. H. *Niemeyer*, Lps. 1840. *Œcolampadii* et *Zwinglii* Epp. lib. IV. (Bas. 1536, fol.), 1592, 4to. This work is preceded by *Osw. Myconii* ep. de vita et obitu Zwinglii. . . . The Lives and select Writings of the Founders of the Reformed Church, with an Introductory by *Hagenbach*, Elberfeld, 1857 sq., 10 vols. *Moerikofer*, Ulrich Zwingli's Life according to original Documents, Leipsig, 1867. **Ægid. Tschudi* (Landamman of Glarus, † 1572), Chron. Helv. ed. Iselin., Bas. 1734, fol., 2 T. (1000–1470); a manuscript work, derived from archives and rare sources; he goes as far as 1570. (Cf. The Life and Works of Giles Tschudi, by *Ild. Fuchs*, St. Gall, 1805, 2 parts). †*Salat*, Chronicles and Full Account of the Commencements of the new heresies of Luther and Zwingli, to the end of the year 1534; manuscript in fol. . . . *Hottinger*, Ch. H. of Switzerland, Zürich, 1708 sq., 4 vols., 4to. *J. Basnage*, Hist. de la relig. des églises réformées (Rotter. 1690, 2 T., 12mo); La Haye, 1725, 2 T., 4to. *Ruchat*, Hist. de la réform. de la Suisse, Genève, 1727 sq., 6 vols., 12mo. *J. E. Fuesslin*, Essay supplementary to the Hist. of the Reformation in Switzerland, Zürich, 1741–53, 5 vols. *Sal. Hess*, Origin, Development, and Consequences of Zwingli's Reform at Zürich, Zürich, 1820, in 4to. *Wirz* and *Melchior Kirchhofer*, Hist. of the Swiss Churches,

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 664–674.

Hosted by Google

Zürich, 1808–19, 5 Pts. †**Riffel*, Hist. of the Church of Christ during modern times, Vol. III., Mentz, 1847. Chronicles of the Reformation, by *George* the Carthusian, Basle, 1849. *Examination* of the prejudices against the Catholic Church, by a Protestant Layman, 3d ed., Lucerne, 1842, 2 vols. Cf. bibliography preceding § 298, and the art. "*Zwingli*," in the Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaedia.

The condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Switzerland, at the opening of the sixteenth century, differed but slightly from that of Germany and other countries. *Literature* and science had received a fresh impulse from the activity of Erasmus, and their study was being prosecuted with unusual ardor and success. The Friends of God, emulating their brethren in the Netherlands, imparted *religious instruction* to the people, and so wide was the influence of the teaching and example of these holy men, that it might be traced north and south from their respective centers of activity, along the course of the Rhine, embracing the whole of that beautiful and fertile district. The *Plenarium*, which was a German translation of the ordinary of the Mass, including hymns, meditations, and prayers in aid of preparation for the reception of the Sacraments, arranged for the use of the people by a Carthusian monk, breathed a spirit of the warmest and purest mysticism. But if this much may be said in a *general* way of the healthful condition of religious practice and feeling, it must be added, on the other hand, that the state of cathedral chapters, the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and the morals of the clergy, regular and secular, were far from satisfactory. We should not, however, omit to mention that the diocesan synod, held by *Christopher Uttenheim*, Bishop of Basle, in 1503, corrected many abuses and disorders, and still attests, by its wise provisions, his enlightened solicitude and pastoral zeal for his flock.

That the seeds of the Reformation, once they had taken root here, sprung more rapidly into life, had a more vigorous growth, and developed the distinctive features of Protestantism with more definiteness of form than they elsewhere attained in the same space of time, is mainly attributable to the peculiarities of the *political* and *ecclesiastical* constitution of Switzerland. Her inhabitants, enjoying *a larger measure of independence* and *a freer democratic constitution* than those

Hosted by Google

of other countries, jealously defended both the one and the other, whether assailed by ambitious foreign princes from without or by worldly ecclesiasticals from within. The charter of rights, secured to the Swiss nation in the instrument called the "*Priests' Franchise*," in 1370, and again renewed and confirmed by the *Treaty of Stanz*, in 1481, was ever regarded by them as the sacred bulwark of their liberties, and their watchful and stubborn defense of its provisions is amply attested in their frequent political conflicts with their bishops. But these guarantees, such as they were, did not secure so large a measure of good to the bulk of the people as they would, had their operation not been impeded by *the imperfect ecclesiastical organization* of the country. There were altogether six bishopricks in the whole of Switzerland, which, however, were not united in *one* ecclesiastical province. Constance and Choire were suffragans of the metropolitan of Mentz; Basle and Lausanne of the Archbishop of Besançon; Como of the Patriarch of Aquileja; and Sion was exempt, having been declared so by Leo X. Finally, Switzerland, enjoying a more liberal constitution than her neighbors, became the resort and asylum of such false mystics as the Lollhards, Beghards, and Beguines, after they had been expelled their own country.

The author of the first religious controversy in Switzerland was *Ulrich Zwingli*, the son of a yeoman, who held the office of landamman, or chief magistrate, in the town of Wildhausen, situated in the Alpine valley of Toggenburg, in the canton of St. Gall. He was born January 1, 1484, and, as he grew up, received an excellent education, studying humanities at Bern, philosophy at the University of Vienna, and theology at Basle, under *Thomas Wyttenbach*. He was a fine classical scholar, and possessed a wide acquaintance with theological writers, and a critical knowledge of theological science. A man of brilliant talents, keen and penetrating intellect and great oratorical powers, he was incapable of profound and well-sustained thought, and wholly destitute of the speculative faculty. Appointed parish-priest of *Glarus*, in the diocese of Constance, in 1506, he attracted the notice of the Papal Legate, through whose kind offices he received an annuity

Hosted by Google

of fifty florins, to enable him to prosecute his literary labors on the Latin classics and the Fathers. In the years 1512, '13, and '15, he served as chaplain to such of the inhabitants of Glarus as took part in the campaigns in Lombardy, fighting in defense of the Holy See against the French, and in consideration for these services received from the Pope a pension, which was continued until the year 1517. After the year 1513, he gave himself seriously to the study of Greek and the New Testament, and in 1516 was appointed preacher in the convent of *Maria Einsiedeln*, where he began to declaim violently against pilgrimages and devotion to the Blessed Virgin. But so little was he suspected of any heretical leaning, that in 1518 Antonio Pulci, the Papal Legate, created him by diploma chaplain to the Holy See. He was shortly obliged to resign his care of souls in consequence of his *amours* with a woman of notorious and profligate character becoming public. He was now called to Zürich, where, receiving the appointment of preacher in the "Cathedral," or Great Minster, he again began to declaim with increased violence against the shortcomings and disorders of the clergy, of which he professed to have had abundant evidence from personal observation, made during his many and protracted sojourns in Italy. He himself afterward made it a matter of boast that he had preached the Gospel of Christ as early as 1516, before even the name of Luther had been heard in Switzerland; and that during the two following years, when the Saxon reformer was still unknown in that land, *he had relied upon the Bible, and the Bible alone.* In his opening address at Zürich, January 1, 1519, he called for a reformation of the Church and a return to purity of morals, and seemed to think an immoral profligate like himself the proper person to effect the one and exemplify the other. That he was lamentably ignorant of the historical development of the Church and the Papacy, his discourses furnish the most abundant proof.[1]

The Zwinglian movement was in some respects strikingly *similar*, and in others strikingly *dissimilar*, to that of Luther. The two reformers were born *within a year* of each other; both

[1] Cf. The Situation of Basle, etc., vide infra, p. 96, n. 1.

Hosted by Google

had visited *Rome* previously to their defection, but they carried away with them very different impressions. Both began *by assailing the preachers of indulgences*, and while Luther defended his teachings in a *disputation* against Eck of Ingolstadt, at Leipsig, in 1519, Zwingli and Œcolampadius defended theirs in a similar disputation at Baden, in 1526. Both possessed the gift of popular eloquence in an eminent degree, and employed it to misrepresent and vilify the Catholic Church and her doctrines; and, finally, both were assisted by men of superior culture and *scientific* training—Luther by Melanchthon, and Zwingli by Œcolampadius.

They were *dissimilar* in this—that while the basis of Luther's system was a *false mysticism*, that of Zwingli's was wholly and thoroughly *rationalistic;* Luther opposed liberal studies and polite learning on principle, Zwingli was an apologist of Paganism and an excessive advocate of its literature; Luther was in a continuous state of morbid unrest, and the victim of harassing and unnecessary scruples; Zwingli was, from the opening of his career, light-minded and frivolous, and a slave to sensual pleasures; Luther, during the early days of his revolt, professed to trust the success of his cause to the power of the word of God, though he invoked the power of the magistracy some time later; Zwingli, from the very beginning, relied on the civil authority for the propagation of his teachings and the triumph of his principles. Moreover, being at bottom a radical republican, Zwingli directed his earliest efforts to an attempt to overturn the Papacy and the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, boasting that he had, three years previously to his defection, taken counsel with Capito *as to the best means of deposing the Pope.* An implacable enemy of all preachers of indulgences, he assailed *Bernard Samson*, a Franciscan, with all the energy of his eloquence and the vehement passion of his nature. Not content with having them excluded from the pulpits of Constance and driven beyond the limits of the city by an order from the bishop, he attacked the doctrine itself, and was delighted to observe that his hearers not unfrequently listened to his furious philippics with undisguised pleasure. In 1520, he obtained from the Grand Council of Zürich a decree commanding that the word

Hosted by Google

of God should be taught wherever their jurisdiction extended, only as found in Holy Scripture, regardless of any ecclesiastical tradition or authoritative interpretation. *Leo X.* summoned Zwingli to Rome to give an account of his teaching; and, still later, *Hadrian VI.*, conformably with his character, wrote him a tender and paternal letter, which entirely failed of its purpose, for the reformer suddenly broke with the Church, and openly proclaimed himself an heresiarch. In 1522, he demanded from Hugo of Landenberg, Bishop of Constance, in his own name, a general *permission for priests to take wives.* "Your Lordship," he candidly said, "very well knows how disgraceful have been my relations heretofore with females (for I would speak only of myself); how these have been the scandal and ruin of many. Since, therefore, I know from personal experience that I can not lead a pure and chaste life, inasmuch as God has denied me this gift, I demand the privilege of taking a wife. I feel within me the carnal lust, of which St. Paul speaks,[1] and have often come to grief in consequence," etc.

When the bishop, instead of acceding to the demand, rigidly enforced the rule of celibacy, and punished any infraction of it with severe penalties, Zwingli severed his last thread of connection with the Church, rejected the authority of ecumenical councils, and in a circular letter, addressed to the Swiss people, declared *celibacy an invention of the Devil.*

In connection with the government of the canton, he arranged for a religious conference to be held at Zürich, in January, 1523, at which sixty-seven theses were proposed for discussion, and challenged the Bishop of Constance and others to meet him, of whom *John Faber*, Vicar General of Constance, alone accepted. The propositions discussed were substantially the same as those defended by Luther, the most remarkable being the following: Holy Scripture is the only source of faith; Christ is the true and only Head of the company of the Saints, of God's elect; the authority of popes and bishops had its origin in pride and usurpation, and is wholly destitute of Gospel warrant or sanction; there is no Sacrifice other than that of Christ for the sins of the world, of which

[1] I. Cor. vii. 9.

Hosted by Google

the Mass is only a commemoration; Christ being our only mediator, we have no need of the intercession of the Saints; God alone having power to forgive sins, confession is only a method of giving and receiving counsel; the doctrine of purgatory is devoid of Scriptural proof; priests and monks have the same right as other men to take wives; the monk's habit is a device to cloak hypocrisy. At the close of the disputation, the Council of Zürich declared Zwingli the victor.

A second disputation was arranged for September of the same year, to which the bishops of Constance, Coire, and Basle, though invited to be present, refused either to go themselves, or to send representatives.

Zwingli and his confederates, *Leo Judae* and *Hetzer*, the latter of whom was subsequently beheaded for his numerous adulteries, now rejected the use of images, abolished the Mass and clerical celibacy, and forthwith took wives, Zwingli marrying *Ann Reinhard*, a widow, with whom he had for many years maintained a criminal intercourse.

Accompanied by many of the magistrates and a number of masons and carpenters, Zwingli went the round of the churches of the city, demolishing images and statues, overturning altars, and destroying the very organs in their insane hatred of whatever called up the memory of the ancient faith. Not content with this, they tore the relics of Saints from their shrines, and buried them away under ground. They would have neither music, lights, incense, nor external ceremony; for the magnificent and imposing grandeur of the Roman ritual, they substituted a cold, cheerless worship, as repulsive as it was grotesque. A plain table took the place of the altar of sacrifice, and goblets of wine and a basket of bread were the human substitutes for the plate and chalice containing the Body and Blood of Christ. The texts of Scripture were read in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, after which the various readings were compared, and the correct sense, according to their understanding of it, evolved. The vernacular text in use until 1529 was a translation of Luther's New and Old Testaments, according to the Hebrew, made into *Switzero-German, and interpreted in a Zwinglian sense* by Leo Judae.

These religious innovations, and the disturbances which

Hosted by Google

they occasioned, excited the fears and called forth the protests of the Catholic members of the Grand Council, who were in consequence deprived of their offices, *and forbidden to celebrate Divine worship after the manner of their forefathers for countless generations.* These officials, together with representatives from various parts of Switzerland, to whom the recent events had given offense, assembled at *Lucerne*, in 1524, and appointed a deputation to go to Zürich to beg their brethren there not to contemn the faith of their venerable Mother, the Church, which they had cherished as a common heritage, and faithfully preserved for fifteen centuries. The deputies were further instructed to say that the assembly of Lucerne was ready to consult with the people of Zürich as to "the best means of shaking off the yoke which the injustice and unwarrantable violence of certain popes, cardinals, bishops, and prelates had laid upon the Swiss people, and of putting an end to the scandalous traffic in ecclesiastical benefices, indulgences, etc." But the Grand Council of Zürich, seeing that these innovations would lead to an increase of the public revenue and heighten the influence of their city in the Confederacy, refused to listen either to the voice of religion or to the appeals of brotherly love. The Council was encouraged in this decision by Zwingli, who, to secure the energetic protection of that body for himself, willingly yielded it, in turn, full exercise of episcopal jurisdiction, or, what was practically the same thing, a corresponding measure of authority in ecclesiastical affairs. He had soon occasion to invoke its aid, for the *Anabaptists*, great numbers of whom were now to be found in Switzerland, claimed, like Zwingli himself, the right of putting their own interpretation upon the Holy Scriptures. Holding that *infant baptism* had no sanction in Holy Writ, and was only an invention of the Papists, they came into conflict with Zwingli, with whom they had a discussion on the point. The Council decided that their teachings were erroneous, and forbade them, under penalty of death, to rebaptize. *Felix Manz*, disregarding the inhibition, continued the practice, was adjudged guilty, and put to death by drowning, in 1526; while his associate, *Blaurock*, a monk of Coire, was let off with a scourging.

Hosted by Google

At Basle, *Œcolampadius* proclaimed himself the champion of the new religious principles. He was born at Weinsberg, in Suabia, in 1482, and studied law at Bologna; but he subsequently relinquished the idea of following this profession, and began the study of theology at Heidelberg.

Appointed parish priest in the city of Basle, in 1515, he soon became intimate with the learned Erasmus, who highly appreciated his classical attainments. The works of Luther had been largely circulated in the city through the efforts of *Froben*, a bookseller. Moreover, *Wolfgang Capito*, a friend of Zwingli's and the leading priest of Basle, and *Reublin*, also a priest of the same place, had already shown leanings toward Lutheranism in their sermons, and preached against the Mass, purgatory, and the invocation of the Saints. In 1516, Œcolampadius was appointed preacher of the Cathedral of Augsburg; but his feeble health preventing him from at once entering upon his duties, he withdrew to Almünster, a convent at a short distance from the city, where he remained for a brief period. When it became known that he was an advocate of the new teachings, he was invited to find some more congenial abode. He then became chaplain in the castle of *Franz von Sickingen*, where he introduced many innovations in religious worship, and after the death of that nobleman, in 1522, he again went back to Basle as a professor of theology, and in 1524 was once more appointed parish priest. He now openly and boldly proclaimed his opposition to the teachings and usages of the Catholic Church, and, to give binding force to his new position, married a handsome young widow, who subsequently became successively *the wife of Capito and Bucer*. *William Farel*, a French nobleman, and the professors, *Simon Grynaeus* and *Sebastian Münster*, became his powerful and effective allies.

The municipal authorities at first declared themselves hostile to any innovations, and instructed the reformers to await the action of a future council; but the partisans of Œcolampadius, refusing to abide by this decision, raised seditious tumults in the city, and in this way forcibly extorted freedom of worship (1527). Once secure in the possession and enjoyment of religious liberty for themselves, their next step, char-

Hosted by Google

acteristically enough, was an attempt to withdraw it from Catholics, the total suppression of whose religion they clamorously demanded (February, 1529). Seizing the arsenal, they plundered it of its contents, and, having placed cannon in position on the principal squares of the city, they rushed into the churches like so many infuriated demons, and after having demolished altars, statues, and images, they made twelve piles of the church furniture and ornaments, and consumed them with fire. Disgusted at this brutal mode of reforming the Church, Erasmus quitted Basle, and took up his residence at Freiburg, in Brisgovia.[1]

Similar scenes were enacted in nearly every city of Switzerland—notably in *Mühlhausen* (1524), *St. Gall* and *Schaffhausen* (1525), and *Appenzell* (1524). In the canton of *Bern*, the most populous and powerful of the Swiss Confederation, an effort was made to correct abuses on the one hand, and on the other to keep out all innovations; but this conservative policy was wholly frustrated by a former disciple of Melanchthon's, *Berthold Haller*, a Suabian († 1536), then a popular parish priest of Bern, who, acting on the cunning and insidious advice of *Zwingli*[2] to another priest of Bern, finally succeeded in bringing the bulk of the people over to the teaching of Protestantism (1528). *Glarus*, *Soleure*, and *Freiburg* leaned in the same direction, and it soon became evident that the Protestant Cantons had a preponderating influence in the Confederation. Hence the representatives of the Canton of Zürich peremp-

[1] *Herzog*, The Life of John Œcolampadius and the Reformation of the Church of Basle, 2 Pts., Basle, 1843. — †*The Condition of Basle Immediately before the Reformation, *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII., pp. 705–746, and 810–836; Vol. XIV., pp. 129–147, 273–291, and 377–392.

[2] †**C. L. de Haller*, Hist. of the Religious Revolution, or the Protestant Reformation in the Canton of Bern. Lucerne, 1836. Zwingli, in a letter to the priest Kolb of Bern, giving instructions as to the way to proceed in propagating the new teachings, speaks as follows: "My dear Francis: We should observe much caution in this affair. You will, therefore, give to these bears at first only one sour pear among a number of sweet ones; then add another and another, and when they begin to have a relish for them, increase the number, mixing sour and sweet; and, finally, empty the whole bag, hard and mellow, bitter and sweet, for, when they have once their heads fairly into the trough, they will not patiently suffer themselves to be driven away. Your servant in Christ, Ulrich Zwingli. Zürich, the Monday after St. George's Day, 1527."

Hosted by Google

torily demanded that such of the Cantons as had not yet embraced the new faith, should be obliged to do so.

To this demand, *Lucerne*, the three original Cantons—viz., *Uri*, *Schwyz*, and *Unterwalden*—and the Canton of *Zug* made a heroic resistance, protesting that they would never abandon the faith of their fathers. It is a little remarkable that these Cantons were precisely the ones in which primitive simplicity of manners and purity of morals were still preserved, and whose inhabitants had but lately been witnesses of the holy life and miraculous deeds of *Nicholas of Flüe*. Their representatives declared over and over again that they had no jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs, and would never consent to assume any.

On the 21st of May, 1526, a disputation took place at Baden, in the Canton of Argovia, between *Eck*, on the one side, and *Œcolampadius*, Zwingli's Melanchthon, and many more divines, on the other, concerning the Mass, purgatory, and the veneration of the Saints, in which, although it was plain the former had gained a complete triumph, the friends of the latter claimed a victory for their champion.[1] Its most important result, however, was the complete alienation of the Protestant from the Catholic Cantons, the latter of which, after having definitely, but reluctantly, joined those of *Freiburg* and *Soleure*, and entered into an alliance with King Ferdinand of Austria (1529), were driven by the outrages[2] of their opponents to retaliatory measures of more than usual severity, if indeed they do not merit a harsher name. The impending struggle was for the time averted by the mediation of the cities of Strasburg and Constance, and the Catholic Cantons in consequence broke off their treaty with Ferdinand; but, for all this, the popular feeling on each side was as deep and as hostile as ever. Hence, when the people of Zürich, under pretense of promoting the glory of God and

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. III., p. 547–556; and *Wiedemann*, John Eck, p. 223.

[2] "The burning of images, and sometimes even of monasteries," *Hase* blandly tells us, "was of course exceedingly painful to the Catholic authorities, especially when it occurred in places subject to their control." Ch. Hist., Eng. trans., N. Y. 1875, p. 388. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

forwarding the interests of the Christian faith, intercepted convoys of provisions destined for the Catholic Cantons, a furious war at once broke out. A battle was fought October 11, 1531, at Cappel, in which the army of Zürich suffered a disastrous defeat; and Zwingli, who, by the command of the magistracy, had gone to the field of battle as chaplain, and, clad in complete armor, had borne aloft the standard of the city, was stricken down, and numbered among the slain. Œcolampadius having been cut off by a malignant plague on the 23d of November of the same year, the coincidence was remarked by the Lutherans, who observed, with brutal malevolence, that "the Devil had given both of them a sudden taking off."

Zwingli was succeeded by *Henry Bullinger*, and Œcolampadius by *Oswald Myconius*,[1] who, together with *Leo Judae*, *Caspar Grossman*, and *William Farel*, continued to spread the new doctrines in Switzerland.

§ 314. *Zwingli's System.*

"Uslegen und gründ der schlussreden oder Artikel"—Explanations and Reasons of the Conclusions or Articles,—veluti farrago omnium opinionum, quae hodie controvertuntur (Zwinglii Opera, edd. Schuler et Schulthess, T. VII., p. 275 sq.) Comment. de vera et falsa religione, Tiguri, 1525; Fidei ratio ad Carolum Imperatorem, Tig. 1530; Christianae fidei brevis et clara Expositio ad Regem Christian. Francisc. I. (ed. *Bullinger*), Tig. 1536, in Zw. opera, T. IV., p. 42–78; De providentia, in opp. T. I. *Zeller*, The Theological System of Zwingli, Tübg. 1853. *Spörri*, Studies on Zwinglianism, Zürich, 1866. *Schweizer*, The Fundamental Dogmas of the Protestants, Zürich, 1854. *Hagenbach*, Hist. of the First Confession of Basle, Basle, 1827. *Sigwart*, Ulrich Zwingli; the character of his Theology, Stuttgart, 1855. Besides the Symbolism of *Möhler* and *Hilgers*, cf. especially *Riffel*, Vol. III., p. 54–102. *Hundeshagen*, Suppl. to the character of Zwingli, along with a comparison to Luther and Calvin (Theol. Studies and Criticisms, 1862, nro. 4).

While Zwingli's claim to having been before Luther in publicly attacking the abuses that had crept into the Church may be allowed, his pretension to any originality of teaching must

[1] *Oswald Myconius* (i. e. Geisshäuter), Antistes of the Church of Basle, by Melchior *Kirchhofer*, Zürich, 1813. Biography of *M. Henry Bullinger* (he had been Dean of Bremgarten), Antistes of the Church of Zürich, by *Sal. Hess*, Zürich, 1828 sq., 2 vols. (incomplete).

Hosted by Google

be emphatically denied. The underlying principles of his system were taken from the writings of Luther, which had been largely circulated in Switzerland shortly after their appearance in Germany, and he could claim as his own no more than a recasting and an adaptation of these principles to suit his own ways of thought and intellectual bent. That he was superficial, and destitute of intellectual gifts of a high order, is evident from the fact that he started by denying that Christianity had anything of mystery in it. The principle upon which his whole system was grounded, and out of which it grew with rigorous consistency, may be briefly stated as follows: *Holy Scripture is the one source of faith*, and man's reason its only interpreter; and, hence, whatever it contains that is above or beyond the comprehension of the human intellect, may be discarded. Zwingli, like all reformers, professed to believe himself divinely inspired, and to have merited by his earnest prayers a direct mental illumination. As regards *his specific teaching*, he held with Luther that man, *in consequence of the sin of Adam, had fallen so completely and hopelessly under the dominion of evil*, that every faculty of body and soul was impaired, and his every act vain, unprofitable, and sinful. Hence, man had no power to do good, and free-will is a fiction. Human nature, being in itself wholly and essentially wicked, evil deeds are as *necessarily* its product as are the branches of a tree the outgrowth of the stem. His *theory of Providence* (*De Providentia*), which is set forth in precise and emphatic terms, is only an extreme form of the fatalistic belief of the Pagans; *human free-will* is totally annihilated; *God is represented as the author of sin, and seems to have a very decided preference for it in its more aggravated forms of treason and murder!*[1] Starting with these wide and sweeping prem-

[1] Epist. an. 1527: Hic ergo proruunt quidam: "Libidini ergo indulgebo, etc.; quidquid egero, Deo auctore fit." Qui se voce produnt, cujus oves sint! Esto enim, Dei ordinatione fiat, ut hic parricida sit, etc. — — ejusdem tamen bonitate fit, ut qui vasa irae ipsius futuri sint, his signis prodantur, quum scilicet latrocinantur — citra poenitentiam. Quid enim aliud quam gehennae filium his signis deprehendimus? Dicant ergo, *Dei providentia se esse proditores ac homicidas!* Yet the caution is added further on: "Sed heus tu! caste ista ad populum et rarius etiam!" Cf. also *Hahn*, Zwingli's Doctrine of Providence. the nature

Hosted by Google

ises, he could accept *no theory of justification other than that of Luther by faith alone*, and no other was admissible. Consistently with his debasing theory of absolute predestination, he asserted and maintained that such distinguished Pagan personages as Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Numa Pompilius, the Catos and the Scipios were among the elect, and enjoyed the fellowship of Christ and His Saints—an opinion which, Luther said, made him a thorough-going Pagan.

Like Luther, Zwingli also *repudiated such works* as in his belief were not inspired by faith, and among these he included *monastic vows*, and everything connected with *indulgences* and *purgatory*. According to his definition, the Church, *whose members are known to God alone*, consists of that great community of Christians who recognize only Christ as their Head, He having no visible representative on earth. Hence the spiritual power of the Bishop of Rome, and of the bishops dispersed over the world, is neither more nor less than usurpation, it having been primarily lodged in the *civil authorities*, from whom it was extorted by the ecclesiastical hierarchy. *The Sacraments*, he said, are but empty signs, having no efficacy, conferring no grace, and are not even tokens of God's favor. They are a sort of advertisement to the public that those who receive them are already in the enjoyment of God's favor.[1] *Baptism* does not cleanse the soul of sin,[2] and make the recipient a son of God; but it is a sign of initiation for those who do not yet enjoy that sonship, and a pledge of continuance for those who do. The *Holy Eucharist* is not itself a sacrifice, but merely a commemoration of the expiatory Sacrifice of Christ, and, hence, the words of institution spoken by Christ are to be taken not in their literal and obvious sense, but in a sense wholly figurative.[3] "Moreover," said Zwingli,

---

and end of man, and also of the election of grace (Studies and Criticisms, 1837, 4th number, p. 765–805).

[1] "Ex quibus hoc colligitur, sacramenta dari *in signum publicum* ejus gratiae, quae cuique privato *prius* adest."

[2] Zwingli, Works, Vol. II., p. 198 b.; p. 477. (Tr.)

[3] A single passage will suffice to show his teaching: "Hoc est, id est, significat Corpus Meum. Quod perinde est, ac si quae matrona conjugis sui annulum ab

Hosted by Google

anticipating the *Calvinistic* interpretation of the words of institution, and replying to it, "those should not be listened to who say: 'We do indeed truly eat the flesh of Christ, but in a *spiritual sense;*' for," he added, "the assertion involves a contradiction of terms." *Confirmation* and *Extreme Unction* he dismissed from his mind as too trifling to claim his serious attention; and *Holy Orders*, he said, is only a ceremonial *induction* into the *ministry of the Word*, and neither confers grace nor imprints a sacramental character on the soul. For where is the good of these external means of grace since the power of God is everywhere visible, *working* in and through all things, not indirectly and as employing agencies, but directly and absolutely; and if Christ, he went on to say, has instituted Baptism and the Eucharist as His *two* signs in the New Covenant, He did so only because *He graciously stooped to accommodate Himself to the weakness of our poor nature.*

Between the cold, barren system of Zwingli and the teachings of Luther,[1] there was nearly as great a contrast as between it and the *faith* of the Catholic Church; and the repulsive aridity of everything connected with Zwinglianism will, in a measure, account for the fact, that, while religious sentiment and warmth of feeling early died out among its professors, they long continued to manifest their presence among those of Lutheranism.

§ 315. *The Sacramentarian Controversy.* (Cf. § 311.)

Loescher, Complete History of the Struggle between Luther and the Reformed, Frankfurt and Lps., 2d ed., 1723, 3 vols. *Lud. Lavater*, Historia de origine et progressu controversiae de coena Domini ab an. 1523–1563, Tiguri, 1564 and 1572. *Hospiniani* Historia sacramentaria, Tig. 1598; 1602, 2 T. f., 1611, 4to. *Bossuet*, Hist. of Variations, Vol. I., p. 48 sq. *Planck*, Hist. of the Origin, Variations, etc. (Vol. II., p. 204 sq., 471 sq.; Vol. III., Pt. I., p. 376 sq.) By the *same*, Hist. of Protestant Theology (Vol. I., p. 6 sq.; Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 89 sq., Pt. II., p. 7. sq.; Vol. III., pp. 150, 274, and 732 sq.) *Moehler*, Symbolism,

hoc ipso relictum monstrans, En conjux hic meus est, dicat." Ibid., Vol. II., p. 293. (Tr.)

[1] Hence Luther, replying to the Swiss deputies, said: "Either one party or the other must necessarily be working in the service of Satan; the matter does not admit of discussion, there is no possibility of compromise." *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 1907.

Hosted by Google

chap. IV., p. 256 sq.; Engl. transl., p. 292 sq. *Hilgers*, Symbolism, chap. VI., §§ 27 and 28. **Riffel*, Vols. I. and II., p. 298–335.

The principle of private judgment introduced by the Reformers, granting to all unrestricted freedom to teach what they liked, and to interpret Holy Scripture arbitrarily, necessarily led at a very early day to grave divisions among the sectaries themselves. Luther was seriously alarmed, and saw the importance of fixing upon some common creed as a basis of doctrine, and a guarantee of unity of teaching. Like Melanchthon, he had violently assailed the *Sacraments*, which, the Church has ever taught, are divinely ordained and efficacious instruments of grace; and, being under the necessity of so shaping and adjusting the details of his system that they would fit in with his fundamental principle of justification *by faith alone*, he denied the teaching of the Church, and affirmed that, instead of being positive means for conveying sanctifying grace to the soul, the Sacraments are no more than signs and symbols designed to strengthen the faith of the believer in the assurance that *he is loosed from his sin*. Hence, he insisted, whoever receives the divine promises with unhesitating faith, has no need of the Sacraments. Notwithstanding this general denial of efficacy to the Sacramental system, he still continued to teach that Christ is really and truly present in the Sacrament of the Altar, and, as to the mode of this Presence, he held for a time that the substances of bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. But his obstinate struggle against the Church, and his heated and acrimonious controversies with the *Sacramentarians*, led him before long to discard these views, and adopt others wholly at variance with them. *Carlstadt* had accepted the early teaching of Luther, and, in consequence, denied the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, because, as he said, it was wholly destitute of Scriptural proof. Luther could not deny the logical justness of the conclusion, and in 1524, when these questions were beginning to create a stir, wrote as follows to Bucer: "Had Dr. Carlstadt, or any one else, been able to persuade me five years ago that the Sacrament of the Altar is but bread and wine, he would indeed

Hosted by Google

have done me a great service, and rendered very material aid in my efforts to make a breach in the Papacy. But it is all in vain; I can not escape; the meaning of the text is too evident; every artifice of language will be powerless to explain it away."[1]

Pirkheimer,[2] who also contributed his share to the controversy in his "*De vera Christi carne et vero ejus sanguine ad J. Œcolampadium responsio*," stated in a letter to Melanchthon, that, in his opinion, Luther's true motive for reaffirming his belief in the Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, apart from his natural inclination to contradict everybody, was a desire to achieve a victory over Carlstadt. There seems to be some truth in the statement, for Luther declared that he would continue to believe, in spite of the Papists, that the Sacrament of the Altar was only bread and wine; and, in spite of Carlstadt, he would continue to raise the Host aloft for the adoration of the people, lest it might seem the Devil had taught him a new lesson. *If a council were to prescribe*, he added, *or to allow Communion under both kinds, he would, only for the sake of being in opposition to such council, admit but one, and utter anathema upon those who, in obedience to the conciliar decrees, should receive under both kinds.*[3] Luther was annoyed that Carlstadt should put precisely the same meaning as himself upon the words of institution; the more so, since the latter had on a former occasion, in explaining the sense of the passage in Matthew xvi. 18, declared, that, in instituting the Blessed Sacrament, *Christ had pointed to His own body*, and that the pronoun τοῦτο properly referred to σῶμα, and not to ἄρτος. In like

[1] *Walch*, Luther's *Works*, Vol. XV., p. 2448. Cf. *Goebel*, Andrew Bodenstein's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper (Studies and Criticisms, 1842, nro. 2). *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclopaed., art. "Karlstadt."

[2] *Hagen*, The Literary and Religious Relations of Germany during the Age of the Reformation, with a special reference to *Willibald Pirkheimer*, Vol. I., Erlangen, 1841. *Charitas Pirkheimer*, Abbess of Nürnberg (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII., p. 513–539; cf. Vol. XLIV., two articles). *Hoefler*, Charitas Pirkheimer, etc., Memoirs of the Age of the Reformation, Bamberg, 1852. *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 167 sq. *Wm. Loose*, Episodes of the Life of Charitas Pirkheimer, Dresden, 1870.

[3] See his Ordinary of the Mass, 1523.

Hosted by Google

manner, Carlstadt explained the awful words of St. Paul: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord,"[1] as conveying only an admonition to the faithful to celebrate the Lord's Supper with gravity and becoming reverence, and to exclude all unseemly hilarity and vulgar carousing. The restraints which publication necessarily imposed upon the two champions were broken through, and gave place to coarse abuse when they came into personal contact with each other. Luther never gave over pursuing Carlstadt, the preacher of Orlamünde, from the day the latter had been driven from the gates of Wittenberg. He went to Jena, and, ascending the pulpit, occupied on the previous day by Carlstadt, greatly amused his audience by his ironical flings at the fanatics. Carlstadt was present, and, stung by the raillery of Luther, at once challenged him to a discussion. They met in the *Black Bear inn of Jena*,[2] and, the argument continuing to grow more animated and heated, they finally transgressed every law of propriety and decency, and discussed the most sacred of subjects—the *Lord's Supper*—in a manner the most frivolous, and in language the most unbecoming. In closing, both pledged themselves to carry on the controversy in writing. "Will you write openly against me, Doctor?" asked Luther. "Yes," replied Carlstadt, "if it is agreeable to you, and I shall not spare you." "Good," rejoined Luther; "there, Doctor, is a florin as an earnest." "May I see you broken on a wheel," said Luther, on taking leave of Carlstadt; "And may you," retorted the latter, "break your neck before you get out of the city." Carlstadt escaped personal violence only by precipitate flight, "and thus," it was said, "was Andrew Bodenstein driven away by Luther without a hearing." He repaired to Strasburg, where he made *Bucer* and *Capito* his allies in his quarrel with Luther. After the close of the *Peasants' War*, in which he had taken part,

[1] I. Cor. xi. 29.

[2] *Martin Reinhardt*, who was present, gives a detailed account of the debate in *Actis Jenensibus;* see *Walch*, T. XV., p. 2423. Cf. *C. A. Menzel*, German Hist., Vol. I., p. 254 sq.

Hosted by Google

he humbly sued for Luther's pardon, and, retiring to the small town of Kemberg, set up as a haberdasher, and for a season ceased to give much attention to polemical controversy. But selling small wares was not to his taste, and in 1528 he once more came forth from his obscurity, again assailed Luther, and was again obliged to quit Saxony. Through the influence of Zwingli, he was granted an asylum in Switzerland (1530), and was set over a parish, and, still later on, became a professor and preacher in Basle, where, as already stated, he was stricken by a plague, and died in 1541.[1]

But if Carlstadt had passed away, his errors lived after him, and *Zwingli* and *Œcolampadius* promptly proclaimed and publicly defended them as their own. Like *Berengarius* in a former age,[2] they put an erroneous interpretation upon the words of institution—Zwingli maintaining, on the authority of Exodus xii, 11, "For it (i. e. the Paschal Lamb) is the Phase, that is, the Passage of the Lord," and other texts of Scripture, that the copula "*is*" means "*signifies;*" and Œcolampadius, that the predicate, "*Body*," means "*symbol*" or "*sign*" of the Body.

In the meantime, fourteen Suabian preachers had published, above their collective names, a document (*Syngramma*), written by *Brenz* of Hall and *Erhard Schnepf* of Wimpfen, in which, while professedly inclining to the Lutheran belief, they seemed to favor the teaching of Zwingli, inasmuch as they held that the Body of Christ, though not really present in the sacramental species, may become so in obedience to the faith of the worshiper. *Capito* and *Bucer* at once saw that the meaning of the "Syngramma" was loose and equivocal, and hoped, by a skillful interpretation of its doubtful passages, to furnish a common ground on which the conflicting parties might agree. But Luther refused to listen to any such compromise. When it was proposed to him, he flew into a towering passion, raving incoherently against Zwingli and his partizans, "*who*," he said, "*were Sacramentarians and ministers of Satan, against whom no exercise of severity, however great,*

[1] *Jaeger*, Andrew Bodenstein of Carlstadt, Stuttg., 1856.

[2] See Vol. II, p. 443, note 1.

Hosted by Google

would be excessive." The works published by Luther at this time against the Sacramentarians[1] are the most solid of all his writings. As long as he devotes his energies to defending the teachings of the ancient faith, instead of assailing them, his style is spirited and vigorous, his proofs clear, and, in many instances, apposite, and his reasoning luminous and conclusive; and for the simple, but potent, reason, that he has the unchangeable Church at his back.

While accepting the words of institution in their literal and strict sense, Luther discarded the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation, and instead adopted one of his own, known as *Con*substantiation, or *Impanation*, according to which the Body of Christ is received *in*, *under*, and *with* the bread (*in*, *sub*, *et cum pane*). This theory he supported by the authority of certain theologians, according to whom the *body* of Christ, because of its union with His divinity, is omnipresent (*Ubiquity*). Zwingli argued, in reply,[2] that if a strictly literal interpretation were to be put upon the words of institution, then no meaning could be drawn from them other than that contained in the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation; but that if, on the other hand, the words: "*This is My Body*," were to be interpreted as meaning: "*This contains My Body*," or: "*This bread is united with My Body*," then, he would ask, in what Luther's *synecdoche* was more tenable or more reasonable than his own *metonymy*. He further contended that the theory of *bodily ubiquity*, in which Luther sought refuge, was subversive of the doctrine of two natures in Christ, and a revival, under another form, of the Monophysite error. Zwingli complained bitterly of Luther's excessive violence against the Sacramentarians. "You cry out that we are heretics," said he, "and should be denied a hear-

[1] *a.* Against the celestial Prophets, in *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 186 sq. *b.* Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Visionaries, in *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 915 sq. *c.* That the words of Christ: "*This is My Body*," are to be retained against the visionaries, in *Walch*, T. XX., p. 950 sq. *d.* Great Confession of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 1118 sq.

[2] "It would require an extraordinary lesson in language," said Zwingli, "to persuade me that the words: '*This is My Body*,' are synonymous with the expression: '*My Body is eaten in this bread*,'" etc. *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 658.

Hosted by Google

ing; you proscribe our books, and denounce us to the magistrates. Is not this doing precisely what the Pope did formerly when truth began to raise her head?"[1]

The controversies and bickerings among the Reformers themselves concerning the most essential truths of Christianity, had at least one good effect: they proved the utter inefficiency and fallaciousness of the principle of private interpretation, which invested every one with the absolute right of construing Scriptural texts after his own fashion, on the ground that their meaning is so very clear that one can not possibly mistake it. The advocates of both parties were obliged to appeal to the tradition of the Church, against which both had intemperately declaimed; and to seek to add weight to their individual opinions, by professing to rest them upon the writings of her Doctors, whose authority Luther had contemptuously rejected.[2] Writing in 1532 to

[1] Cf. § 311, vers. fin.

[2] "All the Fathers," said Luther, "fell into error, and those of them that did not repent before dying are lost eternally." . . . "Their writings are fetid pools, whence Christians have been drinking unwholesome draughts, instead of slaking their thirst from the pure fountain of Holy Scripture." . . . "*St. Gregory* was the first to start the fictions concerning Purgatory and Masses for the dead, and is the author of the whole of them. He knew very little about either Christ or the Gospel, and was so superstitious as to be easily deceived by the Devil." . . . "*St. Augustine* often fell into error, and can not be safely followed. He was a good, holy man; but, like the other Fathers, did not possess the true faith." . . . "*Jerome* I regard as a heretic. He wrote many impious things, and deserves to be in hell rather than Heaven. I know none of the Fathers whom I so much dislike. He is eternally gabbling about fasting and virginity." . . . "*Chrysostom* is a sorry fellow, an empty declaimer, who has filled many books with pretentious trifles, which, when examined, are found to be only a mass of barren and undigested matter—a great puff of smoke and little fire." . . . "*Basil* is worthless; he is a monk through and through, and, to my mind, he is of no weight whatever." . . . "The Apology of Melanchthon is superior to anything the Doctors of the Church, not excepting Augustine, ever wrote." . . . "Nihil ad nos *Thomas Aquinas;* he is a theological abortion, a fount of error, whence issue all the heresies that subvert Gospel teaching." (These sententious expressions of Luther may be found scattered here and there—some in his *Table-Talk,* Frankfurt ed., No. 57, and some in his other works. They are given precisely as found in the several editions of his works as collated by *Weislinger*, in Friss Vogel oder Stirb—*Neck or Nothing*—Strasburg, 1726, pp. 300, 314, and other places.) Cf. also *Döllinger*, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 430–451.

Hosted by Google

Albert of Prussia[1] on the question in dispute between himself and the Zwinglians, Luther said: "This article is neither unscriptural nor a dogma of human invention; it is based upon the clear and irrefragable words of Holy Writ; it has been uniformly held and believed throughout the whole Christian world, from the foundation of the Church to the present hour. That such has been and is the fact, is attested by the writings of the *Holy Fathers*, both Greek and Latin, by daily usage, and the uninterrupted practice of the Church. . . . Were it indeed a new doctrine, or had it been less uniformly observed in every Church throughout the whole of Christendom (or, what is the same thing, had it not the fullest testimony of the most unexceptionable Catholic tradition on its side), to call it in question, or controvert it, would not be so dreadful a matter or so dangerous. . . . To doubt it, therefore, is to disbelieve the Christian Church, and to brand her as heretical, and with her the Prophets, Apostles, and Christ Himself, who, in establishing His Church, said: 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world;'[2] to which the Apostle of the Gentiles added: this 'Is the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'"[3]

And speaking of the *rationalizing* tendencies of Zwingli's teaching, he said: "Were Our Lord to spread wild apples before me, and bid me eat this one or that (as His Body), I should not venture to inquire the reason for doing His bidding." Again, forecasting its inevitable consequences, he uttered these prophetic words: "If the reason be allowed unrestricted freedom in criticising and passing judgment upon God's word and works, not a single article of faith will long survive. . . . In such an event, it will soon

[1] *Luther's* letters against certain intriguers, addressed to Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg (1532), in *Walch*, Vol. XX., p. 2089. *Faber* wrote a whole book on this contradiction in Luther: De Antilogiis Lutheri. Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1531, nro. 57, and *Cochlaeus*, Lutherus septiceps ubique sibi, suis scriptis contrarius, Paris, 1564. Cf. *Frint's* Theological Review, years 1812 and 1813; and *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 336, and Vol. XI., p. 413.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 10.

[3] I. Tim. iii. 15.

Hosted by Google

become apparent that the Zwinglian principles tend not to God's honor and a simple acceptance of His word by faith, but to the formation and fostering of sophistical, captious, and subtle habits of mind, leading directly to a denial of the *Divinity of Christ;* for it is no less unreasonable to say that *man is God*, than to affirm that *bread is changed into the Body* of the Lord."

The course pursued by Melanchthon in this controversy was very damaging to his character for manliness and honesty; for, while hypocritically professing to hold Luther's views on the Lord's Supper, and openly setting them forth in the Augsburg Confession as his own, he in truth favored those of Calvin, as is abundantly shown from the language used by him after Luther's death.[1]

C.—Continuation of the History of the Reformation until the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555).

§ 316. *Progress of Protestantism until the Interim of Ratisbon* (1541).

Le Plat, Monuments pour servir à l'histoire du Concile de Trente, T. II. and III. *Laemmer*, Monum. Vatic., p. 195 sq. *Riffel*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 480–580. A *Menzel*, Vol. II., p. 17–254.

The last act of both the Catholic and the Protestant parties, at the conclusion of the Religious Peace of Nürnberg, was to mutually and solemnly bind themselves to hold a Council at the earliest possible moment. Clement VII., acting upon this pledge, exerted himself to the utmost to have the oft-promised Council convene; but notwithstanding his best efforts, it was again delayed. Conditions were proposed, which the Protestants rejected on pretexts at once novel and futile.[2] To hold the Council in a *church*, according to time-

[1] In the Confessio invariata, they say: "De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi *vere adsint* et *distribuantur* vescentibus in coena Domini, et *improbant secus docentes.*" Here, according to *Salig*, Complete History of the Augsburg Confession, Vol. III., ch. 1, p. 171, there were left out after "Christi" the words: "sub specie panis et vini;" while in the *Variata* the following substitute is found: "De coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere *exhibeantur* corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena Domini."

[2] For an account of the measures taken by him immediately after the Diet of

Hosted by Google

honored custom, they said, would be inconvenient; neither could they bind themselves to the unqualified acceptance and observance of its decrees. They further objected to having it convene at Milan, Bologna, or Piacenza, preferring some city of Germany. Other objections, equally trivial and evasive, were advanced.

After the death of Clement VII., September 25, 1534, his successor, *Paul III.* (October 13, 1534–November 10, 1549), made renewed and still more strenuous efforts to have the Council convene. Through his Nuncio, *Vergerius*, he opened negotiations with the Protestants, and issued a decree of convocation, designating May, 1537, as the time, and Mantua as the place, of holding the Council.[1] Again the Protestants, assembled at Schmalkald, in December, 1535, refused to take any part in it, fully accepting as their own the opinion of Luther, "that the Catholics were not serious in their professions to hold a Council; while the Protestants, being perfectly enlightened upon all points by the Holy Ghost, had no need of it." They went on to express their conviction that a Council, whose methods and forms of procedure should be directed by the Pope, could not be free, and that the Pope himself and his Cardinals should be impeached. The more proper way, they said, would be to have men of known ability and unbiased minds, selected by the princes from *every condition* of life, who, recognizing no *rule or authority other than the word of God*, should examine and pass judgment on the questions in dispute.[2]

The war, which had in the meantime broken out between the Emperor and Francis I., inasmuch as it rendered a journey to Mantua difficult, if not hazardous, furnished the Protest-

Augsburg, cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1530, nros. 175, 176. Cf., moreover, *ibid.* ad an. 1533, nros. 3–8, and *Walch*, Vol. XVI., pp. 2263, 2281; *de Wette*, T. IV., p. 454.

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1535, nros. 26, 30, 32. *Paul's* Encyclica to divers princes, *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2290 sq. *Melanchthonis* Opp., ed. *Bretschneider*, T. II., p. 962 sq. *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. III., c. 17 and 18.—The circular convoking the Council, on June 2, 1536, in *Raynald.* ad an. 1536, nr. 35. Cf. *Pallavicini*, l. cit., lib. III., c. 19. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 606–609; Fr. tr., Vol. 25, p. 1–4, concerning Paul Vergerius, who afterward became an apostate. *Lämmer*, Monum. Vatic., p. 146 sq.

[2] Cf. *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2305 sq.

Hosted by Google

ants a fresh pretext for declining to be present at the Council. The League of Schmalkald, renewed on this occasion for the space of ten years, was strengthened by many fresh accessions, in defiance of the prohibitions of the articles of the Peace of Nürnberg. While, on the one hand, the Protestants were extremely mortified at seeing the proposed alliance between France and England frustrated; on the other, they had every reason to congratulate themselves on the favorable dispositions of the new Elector of Saxony, Frederic the Magnanimous, and on the accession to the League of the Dukes Ulrich of *Würtemberg* and Barnim and Philip of *Pomerania;* of Robert, Count-Palatine of *Zweibrücken;* of the Princes George and Joachim of *Anhalt;* of William, Count of *Nassau*, and of many cities of Germany. Moreover, *Denmark*, a country in which Protestant propagandists had been actively at work since the year 1536, began to manifest such signs as led to a well-founded hope that she also would soon enter the League.

As the time for holding the Council drew near, the Protestants again assembled at *Schmalkald* (February, 1537), and denounced the Pope in language more violent than they had ever before employed. After the publication of Luther's thirty propositions against the authority of Councils, the League subscribed the twenty-three articles of guarantee drawn up by him at Wittenberg in the preceding year, and known as the *Articles of Schmalkald*;[1] which, while expressing in precise and energetic language the violent hostility of the League against the Catholic Church, present a striking contrast with the Augsburg Confession. Moreover, Melanchthon was commissioned to prepare a treatise on the Primacy of the Pope and the Jurisdiction of Bishops (*De potestate et Primatu Papae*); but his views, when submitted to the theologians assembled at Schmalkald, were coldly received, being much too temperate to harmonize with their radical designs. Melanchthon had

[1] Articuli qui dicuntur Smalcaldici e Palatino Codice MS. (Luther's autograph manuscript) accurate editi et annotationibus crit. illustrati, per *Marheineke*, Berol. 1817, 4to. De potestate et primatu Papae tractatus (now serving as an Appendix to the Articles of Schmalkald), in *Melanchthonis* Opp., ed. Bretschneider, T. III., p. 271. Both are found together in *Hase*, Libri Symbol., p. 298–358.

Hosted by Google

said, in substance, that the Primacy of the Pope and the jurisdiction of bishops, though not of *Divine*, were of *human institution* (*jure humano*), and should therefore continue to be retained. The aim and purpose of this treatise was to furnish arguments to those who still cared to attempt a justification of their conduct in renouncing all obligations of obedience to either Pope or bishops. Luther, broken in health and pained by the position taken by his old friend, quitted Schmalkald with these parting words: "*May God fill you with hatred of the Pope.*" From this time forth, the members of the League of Schmalkald were unanimous in their explicit and positive refusal to attend any Council whatever.[1]

Through the efforts of *Held*, Vice-chancellor to the Emperor, a confederation known as the *Holy League*,[2] whose object was to oppose the League of Schmalkald, was formed by the Catholic princes at Nürnberg, in June, 1538. Its members were the Archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg, the Duke of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Henry of Brunswick. In the meantime, the foreign wars, in which the Emperor was engaged, continued to divide his attention and weaken his authority at home. The Protestant League received, in 1538, a fresh accession of strength in the Swiss,[3] with whom, owing to the adroit diplomacy of Bucer and Capito and the demand of the Protestant princes, Luther finally consented to unite on the basis of the *Concordia Vitebergensis*.

Joachim II., Elector of *Brandenburg*,[4] unmindful of the example of his illustrious father, embraced the new teachings in 1539, thus following in the footsteps of his brother, John, Margrave of *Neumark*, who had apostatized three years before. Protestantism was also introduced into the *Duchy of Saxony*

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2426 sq. *Corp. Ref.*, Vol. II., pp. 962 sq., 982 sq. (Tr.)

[2] The official documents are in *Hortleder*, Pt. I., Book 1, ch. 25–29; *Walch*, Vol. XVI., p. 2426 sq.; cf. *Riffel*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 523–526.

[3] Cf. *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 2543; the *Concordia*, written out by Melanchthon, in his Opp. ed. Bretsch., T. III., p. 75.

[4] Joachim II., Elector of Brandenburg (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, 1851, Vol. XXVIII., p. 291 sq.) *Adam Müller*, Hist. of the Reformation in the Margravate of Brandenburg, Berlin, 1839. *Spiecker*, Hist. of the Introd. of the Reform. in the March of Brandenburg, Berlin, 1839 sq., 3 Pts. Cf. *Riffel*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 682–703.

Hosted by Google

by Henry, the brother and successor of Duke George, against the will and in spite of the protests of his subjects.[1] Luther was still indefatigable in his efforts to excite the hatred of the people against both Church and Council, and to this end continued to put forth hostile pamphlets of every size with unwearied activity and marvelous rapidity. It required all the terrors inspired by the recent victories of the Turks, who were now seriously menacing the whole of Germany, to temporarily suspend this religious war. Negotiations were opened at Frankfurt, in February, 1539, which resulted in the conclusion of an armistice for sixteen months.[2] The Emperor, anxious to profit by this interval of peace to effect a reconciliation, summoned the theologians of both parties to a *Religious Conference* at Spire; but, an epidemic prevailing in that city, it was transferred to Haguenau (June, 1540); whence it was again transferred to *Worms*, where, owing to the inexcusable delays caused by the Protestants, it was not finally opened until January 14, 1541.[3] Eck and Melanchthon led off in the discussion, taking as common ground the Confession of Augsburg, a circumstance which gave but poor promise of any ultimate satisfactory result. But, in the meantime, the Emperor dissolved the Conference, and summoned a Diet to meet at Ratisbon, April 5, 1541, whither the celebrated Cardinal *Contarini*[4] repaired to take part in the discussion. To facilitate the adjustment of matters, a committee was appointed by the Emperor, consisting of three theologians from each side. *Eck*, *Julius Pflug*, and *John Gropper* represented the

[1] *Hoffmann*, Complete Hist. of the Reformation in the city and university of Leipsig, Lps. 1739. *Leo*, Hist. of the Reform. in Leipsig and Dresden, Lps. 1834. *Von Langenn*, Maurice, Duke and Elector of Saxony, Lps. 1841, 2 vols. Cf. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 674–681.

[2] The public document is in *Hortleder*, Pt. I., Bk. 1, ch. 32; *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 396 sq.

[3] *Raynald.* ad an. 1540, nro. 15–24; *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 453 sq.; *Melanchthonis* Opp. ed. Bretschneider, T. IV., p. 1 sq.—The first opinion of *Cochlaeus*, in *Raynald.* ad an. 1540, nro. 49. Cf. nros. 54 and 55.

[4] *Pallavicini*, l. c., lib. III., c. 12–15; Acta in conventu Ratisbonensi, ed. Melanchthon, Viteb. 1541. Cf. *ejusdem* Opp. ed. Bretschneider, T. IV., p. 119 sq.; *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 695 sq.; *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 549 sq.

Hosted by Google

Catholics, and *Melanchthon*, *Pistorius*, and *Bucer* the Protestants. The Emperor implored them to lay aside all human prejudices and passions, and for the time being to have in view only the glory of God; and, with the purpose of narrowing the controversy down to essential matters, sent them, through Cardinal *Granvelle*, a treatise which should serve them as a basis and guide in their discussions. This treatise was probably the production of Gropper, and came to be known as the *Ratisbon Interim*.[1] Had it been a *political* paper, and intended for *political* purposes, its plans and suggestions for compromise would have merited, and doubtlessly received, the praise of having been astutely conceived; but judged from a religious point of view, which was its supposed character, it must be said that it set forth the teachings of faith neither clearly nor accurately, and was in consequence severely animadverted upon by the Catholic theologians, notably by Dr. Eck. In spite of this untoward circumstance, it seemed for a time that the Conference would have a happy issue. The conditions of the *Interim* were moderate, and both parties seemed more and more disposed for a reconciliation. But appearances were fallacious, and real difficulties were just as much difficulties as ever, as both parties learned once they came to discuss the fundamental article *on the Church* and the doctrine of *satisfaction*. Whatever may have been the dispositions of the Protestant divines relative to *auricular confession* and *transubstantiation*, when left to themselves, and these were by no means favorable, they absolutely refused to accept either after they had been reënforced by the strictly orthodox Lutheran, *Amsdorf*, whom the Elector of Saxony sent to them as an adviser. They gradually drifted into old traditions and methods, and in the end began to demand the abolition of penitential exercises, good works, monastic vows, indulgences, the veneration of saints, and, in short, everything which in their opinion detracted from the merits of Christ. The Catholic theologians, of course, refused to yield to their demands,

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 725 sq.; *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 551–571; as to Eck's opinion on the Interim, ibid., p. 571, note 1. Cf. also *Unionsmacherei*, i. e. Bungling at Union-making (Review of Lutheran Divinity, 1856, nro. 2).

Hosted by Google

and this Conference, like all those that had preceded it, closed without having effected anything.

By the recess of the Diet, it was ordained that both parties should continue to observe the articles to which they had already agreed, until such time as either a Council or a Diet could be held, with the concurrence of the Pope; that in the interval the Peace of Nürnberg should be observed in every particular; and, as a consequence, that all monastic churches should be secure from all manner of violence. The Emperor also relaxed somewhat the conditions of the recess of the Diet of Augsburg, by suspending all suits at law pending in the Imperial Court of Justice against those whose title to enjoy the privileges of the Peace of Nürnberg was doubtful.[1] But even these concessions did not satisfy the Protestants, who continued to make still larger demands, which the Emperor, though he thought them extravagant, was forced to grant, in order to secure their aid against the Turks.

§ 317. *The Anabaptists at Münster—Bigamy of the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse.*

†*Herm. a Kerssenbroik*, Anabapt. furoris hist. narratio, 1564–1573 (incomplete); *Menken*, Script. Germ., T. III., translated from the manuscript and published at Frankfurt (Münster), 1771, 4to. According to this, *Jochmus*, Hist. of the Reform. at Münster and its Failure caused by the Anabaptists, Münster, 1836. *Faesser*, Hist. of the Anabaptists, Münster (1852), 1861. *Cornelius*, The Humanists of Münster and their Relations to the Reformation, Münster, 1851. By the *same*, Supplements to the Hist. of the Anabaptists, Münster, 1853, and Hist. of the Rebellion of Münster, Lps. 1855 sq. Again by the *same*, The Anabaptists of the Netherlands during the siege of Münster, from 1534–1535 (Essay read in the Munich Academy, 1870, Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 50–111). *Hase*, The Kingdom of the Anabaptists (new prophets, 2d ed., nro. 3), Lps. 1861. *Kampschulte*, Introd. of Protestantism into the Territory of what at present constitutes the Province of Westphalia, Paderborn, 1866. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 580.

Up to the date of the holding of the Diet of Augsburg, Westphalia, acting from purely political motives, had uniformly repelled[2] the persistent and frequent attempts made

[1] Cf. *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 962–1000.

[2] See the account of their wants given in the *Hist. Polit. Papers*, under the heading, "Protestantism at Münster," Vol. IX., pp. 99–108, 129–158, 327–360; and Vol. X., pp. 42–45, 129–146.

Hosted by Google

to introduce Lutheran errors within its borders. But the partisans of Luther, inspired with fresh courage by the action of the League of Schmalkald, grew daily more bold and aggressive; and one of them, *Bernard Rottmann*, chaplain of St. Maurice, near Münster, a visionary and a fanatic, enjoys the distinction of having first preached the new teachings in the streets of that city (February 23, 1532), and, having communicated to the citizens somewhat of his own fanaticism, prevailed upon them to pull down the altars in the churches and to demolish the images of the Saints. With the connivance of the magistracy and the active support of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Protestantism was formally introduced into Münster, as it had already been into the cities of Minden, Herford, Lemgo, Lippstadt, and Soest, and the Catholics were in consequence forced to surrender six of their churches to the victorious sectaries (February 14, 1533).

But the triumphs thus gained by the Protestants were lost, and their further progress retarded for long years, through the *religious* and *political fanaticism* of the Anabaptists, who, finding this new field open to heretical error and sectarian propagandism, and flocking thither in hordes, gave themselves up to every sort of excess and outrage. These sectaries, who began their career of fanaticism at Zwickau, and were generally believed to have been annihilated in the Peasants' War, had scattered themselves over various countries, where they existed in large numbers, and, having neither home nor permanent abode, committed the wildest extravagances. Whilst, on the one hand, the Lutherans abused the liberty which they invoked as their proudest privilege, and made it a synonym for licentiousness; the Anabaptists, on the other, made a pretense of mortifying and crushing out whatever is human in our common natures. Entitled on more than one score to the honor of being the legitimate heirs of the *dualistic Gnostics* and *visionary Montanists* of the early Church, they aspired to a false and extravagant *illuminism*, despised the Sacraments, reprobated all external practices, rejected the established institutions of the Church, and appealed to the Book of Revelations for a confirmation of their pretended millennial ecstasies, which, they claimed, had been revealed to them in fanciful

Hosted by Google

visions and imaginary reveries. One of the most ardent champions of these teachings was *Melchior Hoffman* of Suabia, who exerted his best energies to propagate them in the Netherlands.[1]

John Bockelsohn, a tailor of Leyden, usually called *John of Leyden*, and *Matthiesen*, a baker of Haarlem, going to Münster, found an able and active coadjutor in the Protestant chaplain, Bernard Rottman. Having, with the aid of their adherents, made themselves masters of the city, they set up a *theocratic Democracy*, and proclaimed John of Leyden its autocratic king, while *Matthiesen* assumed the title and office of prophet, and *Knipperdolling*, a burgher, was named high sheriff and general-in-chief of the *Hosts of the Lord*. Twelve judges, constituting a court of justice, surrounded the newly-erected throne, and the city of Münster was designated as the "*City of Sion*," whence was to go forth the *Millennium* of Christ's visible kingdom on earth. Matthiesen, in his office of prophet, and claiming a direct revelation from on high as the sanction of his conduct, ordered all books and manuscripts other than the Bible, and all paintings and images of Saints, which he designated as "instruments of Popish idolatry," to be destroyed, and they were accordingly committed to the flames amid profane dances and scenes of revolting profligacy and fanatical licentiousness. John of Leyden surrounded his newly-erected throne with Oriental pomp and magnificence. He was attended by a numerous guard, and a brilliant court lent luster to his ephemeral reign. By Divine command, so he blasphemously said, he took *several wives*, and polygamy, having the sanction of his illustrious example, became as general among these fanatical enthusiasts as the practice of possessing their goods in common. They were intolerant of opposition, and put down any show of resistance to their institutions by force and violence. Nor was their insolence confined by the narrow limits in which they held supreme sway. John issued a manifesto, in which he pompously proclaimed his intention to take the field, and, in the name of the Lord, to exterminate all the tyrants of the earth. Assured

[1] See *Faesser*, l. c., p. 84.

Hosted by Google

of a victorious triumph in this undertaking, he parceled out in advance, among his followers, the duchies, bishoprics, and abbeys, situated immediately about Münster. To *John Denker*, a shopkeeper, he assigned the Duchy of Saxony; and the Duchy of Brunswick to *Bernard Thomas Moer*, a tailor; while the Duchy of Westphalia, together with the territories lying between the Weser and the Rhine, was conferred upon the patrician, *Christian Kerkerink*. Other royal grants, equally munificent and grotesque, were made to his followers, and ceased only when his imaginary conquests had been entirely disposed of. He further announced that should any one—be he prince, magistrate, or burgher—refuse to receive the apostles sent out by him, he would come himself to destroy and utterly annihilate all such refractory spirits. But before John had time to carry into effect his splendid promises and terrible threats, Count Waldeck, the Bishop and temporal lord of Münster, assisted by many Protestant princes, succeeded in putting a period to the frightful scenes that were daily disgracing the city. The princes at the head of the Catholic army, which had now sat down before the gates of Münster, having summoned John to surrender, received the following reply: "Your favor and your clemency we despise—they are only another name for tyranny. We are content with the favor and assistance of our Heavenly Father, of which we are assured, and hence the offer of clemency by you, who stand in greater need of ours, is blasphemous. Understand, therefore, that it is our firm purpose to defend our religion and our city with the last drop of our blood." Every expedient was resorted to in order to rouse the courage of the multitude, and inspire them with enthusiasm. The preacher Rolle, king John, and many more, rushed like maniacs through the streets of the city, filling the air with cries of lamentation, and calling upon their followers to do "*penance*," and upon the godless to be rebaptized. One of these excited visionaries declared that he had seen Christ coming in the clouds, bearing aloft the standard of victory, and so general did the excitement become that it finally reached all classes, and every age and sex, and *Tilbek*, the chief burgomaster, bending before the fury of popular fanaticism, re-

Hosted by Google

quested to be again baptized. Matters grew daily worse, until, in the end, such as would not submit to be rebaptized were expelled the city. King John prepared a great *federal banquet* for his followers, which was served on the public square before the Cathedral, and to which eight thousand persons sat down. The city made a gallant defense, and it was only after *eighteen* months of incessant struggle that the besiegers succeeded in carrying it by storm (June 25, 1535). John of Leyden, Knipperdolling, and the chancellor, Krechting, after being subjected to every sort of ignominy and outrage, were executed with painful torture (January 23, 1536), and their bodies, incased in iron cages, were for years afterward hung by iron chains from the steeple of St. Lambert's church, as a warning to the citizens. By the capture of Münster and execution of the Anabaptist leaders, the sect ceased to exist as an organized body, although its errors were long cherished and advocated by obscure and insignificant communities scattered up and down Westphalia.

But polygamy, their characteristic institution, found favor in other quarters. Among those to whom this Oriental institution was particularly acceptable, *Philip, Landgrave of Hesse*, surnamed *the Magnanimous*, and the most ardent advocate and zealous defender of the Reformation, was notably conspicuous.[1] He had been married sixteen years to Christina, daughter of George of Saxony, and was the father of eight children; but it was notorious that he lived in habitual adultery during the whole of this time. Unable to stifle the voice of conscience, and unwilling to leave off his old habits of sin, he sought refuge in the convenient Lutheran tenet of "*salvation by faith alone.*" Having thus put the claims of conscience summarily aside, the Landgrave dispatched, through the dextrous and pliant Bucer, a letter to Melanchthon and Luther, in which he expressed a wish to obtain their authorization to take as a second wife *Margaret von der Saale*, maid of honor to his

[1] Landgrave Philip of Hesse, being a Supplement to the picture drawn in the Hist. and Polit. Papers of the schism of the sixteenth century (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIV., Vols. XV. and XVI., but, especially, Vol. XVIII., p. 224 sq., "Philip's Bigamy"). *Hassencamp*, Ch. H. of Hesse during the age of the Reformation, Marburg, 1852, Vol. I. *Herzog's* Cyclopaedia, Vol. II., p. 512–537.

Hosted by Google

sister Elizabeth. He was of an ardent temperament, he said, and of a vigorous constitution, and could not possibly remain alone during his frequent attendance at the diets of the Empire and of his own States, where every one lived for pleasure and enjoyment, while to have his wife and court ladies to accompany him would be troublesome and inconvenient.

Luther and Melanchthon were greatly perplexed. On the one hand, they shrank from the odium that would attach to them should they authorize the Landgrave's adultery; and, on the other, they dreaded, that, in case of refusal, he might carry out his threat, and return to the Catholic Church. But the defection of the Landgrave had more terrors for these pure reformers than the approval of an adulterous union, and they consequently authorized Philip to take a second wife, as they piously expressed it, "*in order to provide for the welfare of his body and soul, and to bring greater glory to God.*"

This instrument, signed by Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, and five theologians from Hesse, went on to say, that to avoid scandal the marriage should be performed privately, in presence of only a few witnesses, and as if under seal of confession.[1]

The marriage ceremony was performed March 3, 1540, at Rothenburg on the Fuld, in presence of Melanchthon, Bucer, and other theologians, by the Hessian preacher, *Denis Melander*, who had special qualifications for the office, having himself taken three wives. This affair for a time disquieted Luther, but he soon recovered his equanimity; "for his great heart," as Bucer writes, "was not easily shaken." Melanchthon, however, was not made of such stern stuff, and the grief and remorse he felt for his part in the transaction brought on a dangerous illness.

Every effort was made to keep the secret of the marriage; but female vanity was not proof against the seductions of notoriety, and the whole affair shortly leaked out.[2] Luther

[1] Instrumentum copulationis Philippi Landgravii et Margaritae de Saal—*Bossuet*, Hist. des Variations, T. I., p. 306. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Seckendorf*, lib. III.; the original pieces are all printed in full in *Bossuet*, Hist. of the Variations of Protestant churches, Vol. I., Bk. VI., at the end; New York ed. of 1851, p. 200–218 (Germ. transl. by Meyer, Vol. I., p. 286–310);

Hosted by Google

declared "that the divulgence of the secret admitted of no defense, and that he would therefore either deny outright having authorized the second marriage at all (a course which he might possibly take, since the authorization was granted for a secret marriage only, which therefore became null and void by being made public); or, should this course fail him, he would come out openly, confess that he had blundered and played the fool, and crave pardon for his fault."

This affair was the occasion of a controversy between Luther and *Henry, Duke of Brunswick*, in the course of which Luther, in a pamphlet directed against the Duke, and entitled "Against the Buffoon," took occasion to show that that gentleman's conduct was not exemplary, and that his relations to his mistress, Eve of Trotta, were not honorable.

The Landgrave, Philip, continued to live a peaceful and quiet life with his two wives, and he had the further gratification of having, after the date of his second marriage, two sons and a daughter born to him by Christina, and six sons by Margaret, the latter of whom were all called Counts of Diez.

§ 318. *Fresh Acts of Violence by Protestants—Renewed Attempts to Adjust Religious Difficulties.*

The bishopric of *Naumburg-Zeitz* falling vacant, the Chapter gave its suffrages in favor of *Julius von Pflug*, a man distinguished for his theological learning, his sweet temper, and pacific disposition; but the Elector, *John Frederic, the Magnanimous*, disregarding the rights and ignoring the action of the Chapter, arbitrarily appointed *Nicholas von Amsdorf* to the vacant see (1542), taking the precaution, however, to grant him only the salary of a parish priest, and to put the temporal administration of the diocese into the hands of an official of the electorate. Luther, who never lost an opportunity to cast ridicule upon the institutions of the Catholic

in *Ulenberg*, Hist. of the Luth. Reformers, Vol. II., p. 468–484. *Schmitt*, Essay of a hist. and philos. Exposition, etc., p. 429 sq. Cf. also "The Tomb of Margaret of Saale" (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 751 sq.; Vol. XVIII., p. 224 sq.; Vol. XX., p. 93 sq.)

Hosted by Google

Church, sacrilegiously consecrated Amsdorf a bishop after his own fashion, and, referring to the affair in his writings, did so in a tone of cynical irreverence and coarse brutality. "We have," said he, "consecrated a bishop without chrism; nay, more, without butter or lard, or suet, or tar, or grease, or incense, or coals."[1]

The forcible intrusion of this farcical bishop into a Catholic see was immediately followed by another act almost, if not quite, so violent and atrocious. *Henry, Duke of Brunswick, whose fidelity to the Catholic Church had always remained constant and ardent*, was engaged in a war against the rebellious subjects of his ducal city of Brunswick, which had joined the League of Schmalkald[2] contrary to his wishes. The city of Goslar had been placed under ban of the Empire by sentence of the Imperial Chamber, and Henry was proceeding to carry the sentence into effect when he was attacked by the princes of the Protestant League, his States invaded and seized (1542), Lutheranism introduced into them, and he himself forced to flee the country, and take refuge in Bavaria.

The *bishopric of Hildesheim*,[3] which had been granted by Imperial award to the Dukes Eric and Henry, became the scene of outrages similar to those perpetrated in Brunswick, which in the sequel were followed by consequences equally disastrous.

The conduct of *Herman*, Count of Wied and (p. 1515) Prince Elector of Cologne, was a fresh source of embarrassment to the Catholic party. He set out by taking up the work of

[1] Cf. *Lepsius*, The Nomination and Induction of Nicholas von Amsdorf, Nordhausen, 1835; *A. Jansen*, Julius Pflug, etc., in *Opel's* New Communications of the Thuringian and Saxon Society, Vol. X., 1, 2, Nordhausen, 1864.

[2] *Lentz*, Hist. of the Introd. of the Evangelical Confession into the duchy of Brunswick, Wolfenbüttel, 1830. *Gietz*, John Bugenhagen, the Reformer of Brunswick, Lps. 1830. †*Hildesheim*, Theological Monthly, Oct. and Nov. nros. of 1851.

[3] Cf. "Lutheranism in the city of Hildesheim," from an ancient manuscript (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vols. IX. and X.) *Reifenberg*, Hist. Societatis Jesu ad Rhen. infer., T. I., p. 251 sq. *Lüntzel*, The Adoption of the Evangelical Confession by the City of Hildesheim, Hildesheim, 1842. Cf. also *Schlegel*, Ecclesiastical and Reformatory History of North Germany, especially of the Hanoverian States, Hanover, 1828, 1829, 2 vols. *Baring*, Hist. of the Reformation of the City of Hanover, Hanover, 1842.

Hosted by Google

Catholic reform, commenced by Gropper, and sanctioned by a Provincial Council held in 1536, and would have experienced but little difficulty in carrying it out successfully in his diocese had he possessed the mental endowments and moral qualifications indispensable to such a task. But of these he was wholly destitute. Of weak and unstable character, he gradually drifted into liberal habits of thought, accepted the new doctrines in their most radical sense, and ended by introducing Protestantism into his States according to a form drawn up by Bucer and Melanchthon, the former of whom opened a course of lectures on exegetics in the Franciscan convent of Bonn, the usual summer-residence of the Archbishop of Cologne. The Reformers, however, were far from having matters all their own way. They were resolutely and vigorously opposed by the canons of the Metropolitan Chapter of Cologne, who also published a refutation of the new teachings (*antididagma*). The members of the city council took sides with the Chapter, and both bodies were encouraged by the Pope and the Emperor to continue to offer a determined resistance to the Reformers. The Archbishop, appreciating the danger of his position, professed to yield; but it shortly appeared that his professions were insincere, and intended only to gain time. An appeal against him, drawn up in the name of the States, the Clergy, and the University, was then made to the Pope and the Emperor, by whom he was summoned to give an account of his conduct, which failing to do, he was stript of his possessions, and declared excommunicate.[1] He then made application to be admitted into the League of Schmalkald, and had the mortification of having his request refused; he invoked the intervention of the Protestant princes, and received in reply fair

[1] †*Deckers*, Herman von Wied, Archbishop and Elector of Cologne, Cologne, 1840. *Meuser*, s. v. Herman von Wied in the Third Vol. of *Aschbach's* Eccl. Cyclopaed. †*Pacca*, Cardinal, "Memorie Storiche," Roma, 1832, in which is a report of the Great Services rendered to the Cath. Church during the sixteenth century, by the Clergy, University, and Municipality of Cologne (Transl. from the Ital. into Germ., Augsburg, 1840). *Ennen*, Hist. of the Reformation in the Territory of the Archdiocese of Cologne, Neuss, 1849. The *same* treats this subject exhaustively in his "Hist. of the City of Cologne."

Hosted by Google

promises, which were never made good; and having thus experienced disappointment after disappointment, he was finally forced to content himself with the single county of Neuwied († 1552).

But on the other hand, in addition to the countries of North Germany already mentioned, the cities of *Magdeburg*, *Halberstadt*, *Halle*, *Meissen*, and others, were also severed from the Church;[1] and efforts were made to introduce Protestantism into the States of the Most Catholic, Dukes of *Bavaria*, into those of King *Ferdinand*, into the *Tyrol*,[2] and elsewhere. Everywhere the prospect of becoming hereditary princes was held out to Catholic bishops as a bribe to induce them to embrace Protestantism.[3]

Finally, the Protestant princes, by putting a dishonest interpretation upon the acts of the Diet of Spire (1542), where the chief question related to the raising of subsidies to be employed against the Turks (a matter which gave them very little concern), sought to justify their deeds of violence against Brunswick and Naumburg, and to find a pretext for dismissing all the suits at law pending in the Imperial Chamber. Consistently with their former policy, they refused to take any part in the General Council which had lately been convoked to meet at *Trent*.

Still, the Emperor, desirous of having peace, and willing to pay almost any price to secure it, made concessions so extensive to the Protestants at the late Diet of Spire (1544), that the Catholics, not without reason, charged him with having outstepped the bounds of his power, and Pope Paul III., in a letter, dated August 24, 1544, expressed his sorrow at the

[1] Introd. of the Reformation into the Archdiocese of Magdeburg (*Fiedler*, Pastoral Gazette of Torgau, 4th year, 1842, Jan., Feb., March, and May). *Franke*, Hist. of the Reformation in the City of Halle, Halle, 1841. *Apfelstedt*, Introd. of the Lutheran Reform into the District of Schwarzburg, Sondershausen, 1841 (For the Jubilee of 1841). *Fraustadt*, The Introd. of the Reform into the Bishopric of Merseburg, Lps. 1844.

[2] Reformatory Intrigues in *Bavaria*, in the middle of the sixteenth century (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., p. 14–29). Schism of *Tyrol* (*Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 577–609). †*Beda Weber*, Tyrol and the Reformation, Innsbruck, 1841.

[3] *Hase*, Ch. H., Engl. trans., N. Y. 1873, p. 392. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Emperor's action, and his serious apprehension as to its consequences. Charles having, with the coöperation of the Protestants of his Empire, from whom he had been fortunate enough to obtain a declaration of war against France, compelled his haughty adversary, Francis I., to sign the *Peace of Crespy* (September 18, 1544), set to work to dissipate the doubts which had been cast upon his conduct, and to place himself in his true character before the world. He in consequence urged that a General Council should be convoked to assemble March 15, 1545.

At a late Diet held at *Worms* (March, 1545), the Protestants again expressed their determination to take no part in *the proposed Council of Trent*, because it had been convoked by the Pope. In giving expression to their sentiments on this occasion, they employed language unusually coarse and violent even for that age. They were also at pains to scatter throughout the Catholic States copies of Luther's work entitled "*The Papacy an Institution of the Devil*," preceded by an indecent and brutal frontispiece,[1] and accompanied by a tract, written by *Melanchthon*,[2] in which the author did his best to malign

[1] *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 1278 sq.; also printed separately, with annotations by Abbot *Prechtl*, in his "Fragments in Refutation of the Wisdom of Dr. Martin Luther," intended as contribution to the Jubilee of the Lutheran Reformation, 3d ed., Sulzbach, 1818.

[2] Melanchthon wrote by order of the Prince-Elector: "Causae, quare et amplexati sint et retinendam ducant doctrinam . . . confessionis Aug. . . . et quare iniquis judicibus collectis in synodo Trident., ut vocant, non sit adsentiendum." Vit. 1546. (Opp. ed. Vit., T. IV., p. 772). The following are the chief points brought out by Melanchthon: 1. One should obey God rather than man; 2. The Pope has no authority to convoke a Council; 3. The Bible, and the Bible only, can be used in determining what is Christian faith; 4. The warrant for the truth of Protestant teaching is to be found in the fact that it is held by thousands; 5. Inasmuch as laymen are excluded from the Council of Trent, it can not be said to be a general council; 6. The place of assembling is itself a circumstance calculated to excite distrust; 7. Nothing good can be expected from the Bishops assembled there, for they know as little of the teaching of Christ as the asses upon which they ride. It will only be necessary to *place beside this ribald and insulting language the loving invitations repeatedly addressed to the Protestants by the Council and the Popes*, imploring them to unite in securing harmony to the Christian world, to see the wide difference between the spirit by which each party was animated. Sess. XIII., De Reformatione, c. 8; Sess. XV.; Sess. XVIII.

Hosted by Google

and insult Catholics. Notwithstanding these acts of determined hostility, the Emperor still clung to the vain hope of settling the religious difficulties by conference, and he accordingly summoned one to be held at *Ratisbon*, January 27, 1546. It seems strange that he should not have foreseen that this conference, apart from the fact that the assembling of such a body for such a purpose after the Council of Trent had already been opened, was a practical ignoring of the authority of the latter, could accomplish no possible good in the existing temper of the Protestant mind.[1]

Their action, however, left the Emperor free to assume a more aggressive attitude, which, having concluded an armistice with the Turks, he was now in a position to do. He began to make preparations for war, and openly declared to the Protestant princes, who questioned him on the subject, that while no token of his good-will should be withheld from the loyal States of his Empire, every resource of his imperial power should be put forth to reduce those in rebellion to subjection. He also issued a proclamation to the whole Empire, stating that the war in which he was about to engage was not one of religion, and that his sole purpose in undertaking it was to compel the submission of those who, under cover of religion, had disturbed the public peace, and committed numerous and flagrant acts of violence. He declared the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector of Saxony, both of whom were marching toward the Danube at the head of numerous armies, under ban of the Empire.

§ 319. *Death of Luther—His Public Character.*

Döllinger, The Reformation, Vol. I., p. 278 sq.; Vol. III., p. 251–253. *Von Görres*, Luther's work, and Luther's Works (Catholic of 1827). (Doller) Luther's Catholic Monument, Frankfort, 1817. The Luther Monument of Worms, etc., see Vol. II., p. 979, note 2.

The trials and contradictions which came to Luther from every quarter had early soured his temper, and made him

[1] Actor. colloquii Ratisbonen. ultimi verissima relatio, Ingolstadii, 1546, 4to. (printed by order of the Emperor.) Report of *G. Major*, Wittenberg, 1546, 4to. (*Hortleder*, Pt. I., Bk. 1, ch. 40); by *Bucer*, ibid., ch. 41, and in *Walch*, Vol. XVII., p. 1529. See *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 742 sq.

Hosted by Google

discontented and morose. Himself dissatisfied, according to his own avowal, with his religious system,[1] he had the further mortification of knowing that it had a still more uncertain hold upon the minds of his former adherents. Even at Wittenberg, the scene of his own zealous and extraordinary labors, no moral improvement was visible among the inhabitants. In a sermon, preached as early as 1532, he had made this candid confession: "Since we have commenced to preach our doctrine (the *pure* doctrine of the Gospel), the world has grown daily worse, more impious, and more shameless. Men are now beset by legions of devils, and, while enjoying the full light of the Gospel, are more avaricious, more impure, and repulsive, than of old, under the Papacy. Peasants, burghers, and nobles—men of all degrees, the highest as well as the lowest—are all alike slaves to avarice, drunkenness, gluttony, and impurity, and given over to shameful excesses and abominable passions."[2] Unable longer to witness patiently the steadily increasing wantonness and libertinism of the inhabitants of Wittenberg, he quitted the city in angry disgust, resolved never again to enter it. "Let us go out from this Sodom," he wrote to his wife in July, 1545. "I had rather,"

[1] "Alas!" he cried out on one occasion, "there was a time when I could believe anything on the authority of the Pope and the monks; but now my reason rejects even what comes to me on the authority of Christ, who can not possibly lead me astray." On another occasion, at the close of the singing of grace before meals, he remarked: "Should one say that that singing is really good, he would be about as near the truth as if I should say that I believe the teachings of theology to be true." M. Anthony Musa, pastor of Rochlitz, once remarked to Luther with candid frankness that he *could* not himself believe what he preached to others, to which the latter replied: "Praised be God that there be others no better off than myself. I had fancied myself the only person in such a frame of mind." Musa continued during his whole life to take comfort from these consoling words of his master (Table-Talk). There is something strikingly characteristic in the devices employed by Luther *to stifle the voice of conscience*, and the inspirations of the Holy Ghost speaking through it. He professed to regard these salutary warnings as *so many devices of the Devil*, and struggled against them accordingly. "The Devil," he said, "has often upbraided me, and entered into controversy concerning the affair I have in hand; but," he complacently continues, "I had rather the temple should be destroyed, than that Christ should remain hidden and unknown." Cf. *Menzel*, Vol. II., p. 427-429.

[2] Conf. *Döllinger*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 289 sq., 297 sq., 306 sq., and p. 167 sq.

Hosted by Google

he continues, "go about the world as a stranger, and eat the bread of a beggar, than pass the few remaining miserable days of my life as a martyr in Wittenberg, to the detriment of my hard but precious labor." He, however, returned again to that city, but only at the urgent solicitation of the University and the Elector.

While the principal points of Luther's teaching were being discussed at Ratisbon, he himself, though ill in health, made a journey to *Eisleben*, at the request of the Elector of Saxony, for the purpose of arbitrating between the Counts George and Albert of Mansfeld, who were disputing about the boundaries of certain mining districts. But his efforts to adjust matters were not more successful than those of the lawyers had been, out of whose hands he had taken the litigation on his arrival.[1]

Ascending the pulpit of St. Andrew's Church, in Eisleben, for the last time, Luther once more called down the vengeance of heaven upon the Jews, a race of people whom he had so unjustly and virulently assailed in his earlier writings, that his followers after his death were confused at the very mention of his malignant denunciations. In his first pamphlet against them, he called upon Christians to take the Bible from them, to burn their books and synagogues with pitch and brimstone, and to forbid their worship[2] under penalty of death; and in his second, entitled "*Of Shem Hamphoras*," he describes them at the very outset as "young devils doomed to hell," who should be driven out of the country.

Luther, after drinking and feasting, and jesting with his friends on the death of Pope Paul III. and the downfall of the Papacy, was taken suddenly ill on February 17, 1546, and

[1] Luther's Letters, apud *de Wette*, Vol. V., p. 753.

[2] Cf. *de Wette*, Vol. V., p. 610. When, on one occasion, in 1546, Luther was journeying through the territory of the Counts of Mansfeld, on entering a village inhabited by Jews, a cold, frosty wind whistled about his ears and almost froze him, he insisted that the Jews had malignantly evoked the chilling breezes, and accordingly wrote to his wife, in a letter dated February 1, 1546: "When I shall have finished my chief business, I shall devote my energies to the expulsion of the Jews. Count Albert hates them heartily, and has declared them outlaws, but so far no one has done them harm. Should it be God's will, *I shall mount the pulpit*, and, with Count Albert, declare them beyond the pale of the law."

Hosted by Google

died on the night of the following day. Thus suddenly and prematurely was Luther stricken down in the town where he had been born and baptized, after he had passed his life and exerted his powerful influence in setting people against people, sundering social bonds, and inflicting a severe, though not as he fancied, *fatal wound* upon the Church of his fathers. "But this wound," as *Moehler* well observes, "served also for the discharge of impurities which wicked men had introduced into the body of the Church—a thought full of comfort where there are so many painful reflections."

Luther closed[1] his career of a Reformer as he had opened it, breathing hostility against the Pope, and uttering driveling contradictions like the following: "*The Pope is the most holy and the most devilish of fathers.*" His teachings, like his life, are full of inconsistencies.[2] Shortly before his death, he declared that the Scriptures contained mysteries and unfathomable depths, in the presence of which one must humbly bow his head.[3]

But however numerous and glaring may have been the inconsistencies of Luther's life and teachings, he was always at one with himself in insolent pride and self-sufficiency, and in the *testament* containing his last will showed his usual

[1] The following are among the most significant sentiments of Luther: "Nos hic persuasi sumus ad papatum decipiendum *omnia* licere." And again: "Pestis eram vivus, moriens ero mors tua, papa!" The latter is to be found in a letter written after his departure from Schmalkald (*de Wette*, Luther's Letters, Vol. V., p. 57), and again repeated, immediately before his death, in his pamphlet, entitled "*The Papacy an Institution of the Devil.*" His partisans continued long afterward to approve them, by making them serve as legends for *jubilee medals.* Cfr. *Pasig*, The Writings published on the Occasion of Luther's Centenary Jubilees, Lps. 1846.

[2] Hence *Cochlaeus* wrote: "Lutherus septiceps ubique sibi suisque scriptis contrarius," Paris, 1564. Cf. *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 336; Vol. XI., p. 413.

[3] It is a great and difficult thing to understand the Scriptures. Five years' hard labor are required to understand either the Georgics or Bucolics of Virgil; an experience of twenty years to be master of the epistles of Cicero; and one hundred years' study of the prophets Elias, Eliseus, of St. John the Baptist, Christ and the Apostles, to get a mere insight into the Scriptures.

Hanc tu ne divinam Æneida tenta,
Sed vestigia pronus adora.

Of a truth it may be said, poor human nature!

Hosted by Google

impatience and contempt of all the accepted forms of human right and law.[1]

Judging Luther by the wonderful activity and tumultuous excitement of his life, he is one of the most remarkable men the world has ever produced; but regarding him in his character as a *reformer* of the Church, he made the most disastrous failure of any person who ever attempted that difficult task, for the reason that he was totally destitute of the necessary virtues of charity and humility. Arrogantly rejecting the authority of the Church, he soon learned that he had acted precipitately and unwisely, and was forced to shelter himself behind it to successfully defend himself against his adversaries. That he possessed courage is undeniable; but it is equally true that his courage frequently degenerated into foolish *bravado*. His *activity* was ceaseless and untiring, and his *eloquence* popular and captivating, his mind quick, his imagination brilliant, his character unselfish, and his temper profoundly religious. This overmastering religious sentiment, so characteristic of his system, contrasts strangely with the habitual blasphemy and sarcasm of his language. Hence, Erasmus said that he was a compound of two personalities. "At times," says the scholar of Rotterdam, "he writes like an Apostle, and again he talks like a fool. His jests are so coarse, and his thrusts so reckless, that he seems utterly forgetful of the figure he is cutting, or the spectacle he is presenting to the world." When I pray (i. e. say the Our Father), said Luther on one occasion, I can't help cursing the whole time.[2] While declaiming against the use of arms in vindicating the rights of religion, he put forth principles and em-

[1] "Notus sum," it is said there, "in coelo, in terra et inferno, et auctoritatem ad hoc sufficientem habeo, ut mihi soli credatur, quum Deus mihi homini licet damnabili et miserabili peccatori ex paterna misericordia Evangelium filii sui crediderit dederitque, ut in eo verax et fidelis fuerim, ita ut multi in mundo illud per me acceperint, et me pro doctore veritatis agnoverint, spreto banno papae, Caesaris, regum, principum et sacerdotum, imo omnium daemonum odio. Quidni igitur ad depositionem hanc in re exigua sufficiat, si adsit manus meae testimonium et dici possit, haec scripsit D. Mart. Luther, notarius Dei et testis Evangelii ejus?" (*Seckend.*, lib. III., p. 651.)

[2] A number of these Our Fathers, embellished with profane oaths, may be seen in *Weislinger*, l. c., preface, p. CCCCVIII. sq.

Hosted by Google

ployed language that might have done honor to a Jacobin of the eighteenth century. Apparently *frank* and honest in his advocacy of an unlimited freedom in interpreting the Holy Scriptures, he refused to his adversaries the right which he vauntingly arrogated to himself; and, while proclaiming the glorious prerogatives of free inquiry, conducted himself toward his most devoted adherents and most intimate friends, Melanchthon among the rest, as a tyrant and a despot. So imperious was he in the assertion of his magisterial authority, and so exacting in its exercise, that Melanchthon confesses that, in his own case, it amounted to a degrading slavery (*Tuli servitutem paene deformem*).

When it is further borne in mind that Luther was both a glutton and a drunkard, having so little regard for ordinary proprieties that he brutally wrote to his wife, in a letter dated July 2, 1540, "*I am feeding like a Bohemian and swilling like a German, thanks be to God;*"[1] that in speaking of marriage, the most sacred of social institutions, he gave utterance to thoughts so indecent in language, so coarse and revolting, that one seeks in vain to find an apology for him in the lax morals of that lax age;[2] and that he employed this language not alone at *table*, but in his published writings and public addresses, one feels bound, apart from any consideration of the perversity of his principles or the falsity of his teachings, to say that he is hardly such a person as would be singled out as having received a vocation to inaugurate and carry out a moral reform. It has always been characteristic of those who have had any success in carrying out reforms in the Church, that they began their work by first reforming themselves, and it is hardly necessary to remark that this was not Luther's

[1] *Burckhardt*, Correspondence of Dr. M. Luther, Leipsig, 1866, p. 357.

[2] Hence the strong expostulations addressed to him by his friends, given by *de Wette*, Vol. II., p. 49; Vol. IV., pp. 271, 276. Count *Hoyer of Mansfeld* wrote, in 1522, as follows to Count Ulrich of Helfenstein: "I have been all along, as I was at Worms, a good Lutheran; but I have learned that Luther is a blackguard, and as good a drunkard as there is in Mansfeld, delighting to be in the company of beautiful women and to play upon his flute. His conduct is unbecoming, and he seems irretrievably fallen." Cf. Luther's Correspondence, in *Burkhardt*, in the Supplement to the Augsburg Universal Gazette of January 18, 1867.

Hosted by Google

method. To discover the notes of a reformer in the ungovernable transports, the riotous proceedings, the angry conflicts, and the intemperate controversies which made up the life of Luther, presupposes a partiality amounting to blindness.

"It must be evident," says Erasmus, "to the most feeble intellect, that one who raised so great a storm in the world, who always found pleasure in using language either indecent or caustic, could not have been called of God. His arrogance, to which no parallel can be found, was scarcely distinguishable from madness; *and his buffoonery was such that it could not be supposed possible in one doing the work of God.*"[1]

His character is accurately portrayed in the following brief sketch from the pen of *Pallavicini*. "The products of his prolific genius," says the distinguished historian of the Council of Trent, "were extravagant and abnormal, rather than choice and correct—resembling more some gigantic offspring of immature birth, than the shapely babe brought forth after the lapse of nature's appointed time. His intellect was vigorous and robust; but its strength was expended in pulling down, not in building up. Gifted with a tenacious memory, he had acquired a vast deal of erudition, which he poured forth, as the occasion demanded, in impetuous torrents, resembling a thunder-storm in its angry and destructive fury, rather than the refreshing rains of summer, that brighten and gladden the face of nature. He was an eloquent speaker and writer; but his eloquence was more like the rush of the whirlwind, blinding the eyes with a cloud of dust, than the placid flow of a peaceful fountain, delighting them with light and color. His language was such that, throughout the whole of his works, not a single sentence can be found wholly free from a certain coarseness and vulgarity. Courageous to temerity in prosperous, he was cowardly to abjectness in adverse fortune. Professing his readiness to remain silent if his adversaries would do the same, he clearly showed that he was actuated, not by a motive of zeal for God's glory, but by feelings of jealousy and self-love. Princes were among

[1] *Erasmus*, Hyperaspistes, Diatribe adv. servum arbit. Lutheri.

Hosted by Google

his followers; but they became such not from any desire of forwarding his cause, but in the hope of enriching themselves with the property of the Church. The harm he did to the Church was indeed great; but, while bringing incomparable disaster upon others, brought no advantage to himself. His name will be memorable in history for all time, but as a name of infamy and dishonor. Now that the rotten branches have been lopped from the vine of the Church, the sound and living ones will thrive and flourish all the better for their absence."

Ancillon, an acute observer and faithful delineator of human character, has also given us a picture of Luther,[1] but its outlines are not more flattering or less repulsive than those of Pallavicini.

But in spite of these adverse criticisms, the followers of Luther have bestowed upon the memory of their founder an honor which the Church reserves for her greatest Saints, and for doing which Catholics have been reproached with committing a scandalous impiety.[2]

§ 320. *The Schmalkaldic War—Religious Peace of Augsburg* (1555)—*Resignation and Death of Charles V.*

Hortleder, Vol. II., Bk. III., p. 618 sq. Note-book of Emperor Charles V., German, by *Warnkoenig*, Lps. 1862. *Camerarii* Comm. belli Smalc. graece script. (Freher, T. III., p. 557). Hist. of the Smalkaldic War, by *Hahn*, Lps.

[1] *Ancillon* expresses his judgment of the heresiarch in the following words: "His acts were the result of passion, rather than the outgrowth of fixed principles; and if, on the one hand, his character was not soiled by degrading vice, on the other, it was not ennobled by distinguished virtue. On the whole, admitting that he was gifted with genius, it can not be denied that *he was destitute of moral qualities of a high order.*" Cf. also *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the Close of the Fifteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 524 sq.

[2] In proof of this statement, we refer the reader to the following work, written on occasion of the Jubilee of the Eighteenth Century: "The Gold and Silver Memorial of the Dear Master in God, Dr. M. Luther, in which a detailed account is given of his death, his family, and his relics, based upon above two hundred very curious medals and engravings, with pertinent remarks by Christian Junker, Historiographer to the Illustrious Prince of Saxony-Henneberg," Frankfort and Leipsig, 1706, p. 562. This is just what he foretold his followers would do once he had passed away. In his Table-Talk, he says: "Adorabunt stercora nostra et pro balsamo habebunt."

Hosted by Google

1837; by *Jahn*, Lps. 1857. *Pallavicini*, lib. VIII., c. 1. *A. Menzel*, Vol. II., p. 451–472; Vol. III., p. 1–480. *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 733–760.

The chiefs of the Protestant League had been placed under ban of the Empire in an edict published by the Emperor, July 20, 1546, a course which received fresh significance and increased importance from a bull published by Pope Paul III., proclaiming a crusade, and calling upon the Church to contribute toward carrying it on.[1] When, however, war was finally declared, the Protestant princes were found fully prepared for the conflict. The League of Schmalkald had already been in existence for fifteen years, and the army of the Lutheran princes was in every way vastly superior to that of the Emperor, from the fact that some Catholic princes, jealous of his power, refused to range themselves under his standard. Charles was anxious, in case of success, to dictate his own terms of peace, and in consequence delayed calling them to his aid until he could no longer dispense with their assistance without peril to himself.

On the other hand, although *Schertlein* of Burtenbach enjoyed at the time the reputation of being an able commander,[2] it is nevertheless true that his reputation was undeserved, and that there was no man possessed of real military talent on the Protestant side. Again, *Maurice of Saxony*,[3] a Protestant, who had succeeded to Henry, his father, in the government of the Duchy of Saxony, in 1541, passed over to the Catholic party. Apart from the fact that his father's attachment to the Protestant League had been greatly weakened by the influence of the former counselors of Duke George, Maurice, who was a nephew of the latter prince, and had been brought up at his court, was repelled by the manners and detested the character of the Elector, John Frederic. Still, having married the

[1] Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1546, nro. 94. The Pope promised an Indulgence to the Crusaders; the Protestants, in turn, had public prayers offered up against the Pope and the Emperor, as enemies of the word of God. *Walch*, T. XVII., p. 1832 sq.

[2] Sebast. Schertlein of Burtenbach and his Letters to the Diet of Augsburg, published by *Th. Herberger*, Augsburg, 1852.

[3] *Von Langenn*, Maurice, Elector of Saxony, and his Age, Lps. 1841, 2 vols. *Cornelius*, Illustration of the Policy of Maurice, Elector of Saxony (*Munich* Annuary of History, year 1866).

Hosted by Google

daughter of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, he could neither fail to perceive, nor was he wholly insensible to, the advantages which he might reap by embracing Protestantism. The Emperor Charles, who had already had experience of Maurice's valor and capacity during his campaign against France, desirous to again secure his services as an ally, induced him to break off his connection with the League of Schmalkald, on the plea that he might now conscientiously do so since the Protestants had signified their intention not to attend the Ecumenical Council. Maurice accordingly accepted the Emperor's terms, entered into a compact with him (June 19, 1546), and further pledged himself to give such *obedience* to the decrees of the Ecumenical Council *as they should receive from the other Princes of the Empire.* He then proceeded to march an army into the States of the Elector of Saxony, of which he took forcible possession under pretense of preventing them from falling into the hands of Ferdinand, King of the Romans. When the news of this bold act reached the Elector, who was encamped with the allied army on the borders of Suabia and Bavaria, he at once set out for Saxony. After the disbandment of the Protestant army, toward the close of autumn, city after city returned to their allegiance, and, by the opening of the following spring, the whole of Southern Germany had been reduced to submission without the shedding of a drop of blood. The Elector of Saxony, who had in the meantime regained possession of his States, while encamped in the forest of Lochau, *near Mühlberg*, was surprised by the imperial forces, suffered the total destruction of his army, and was himself made prisoner (April 24, 1547). Shortly after, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, surrendered at discretion; but, owing to pledges of security given by his son-in-law, Maurice, who had succeeded to the Electorate of Saxony, thus crippling the power of the Protestants, he was permitted the enjoyment of a restricted freedom. The Emperor having secured these splendid triumphs, not only without the concurrence of a single Catholic prince, but with the aid of a Protestant one, had no intention of employing the advantages they gave him either to extend his own dominion, or to compel Protestants by force to enter the Church. The latter end

Hosted by Google

he hoped to secure by some amicable arrangement. To some over-zealous advisers, who referred to Caesar's habit of following up a victory by the total destruction of the enemy, the Emperor replied: "The Ancients were guided by the principles of *honor only;* we Christians by the principles *both of honor and of conscience.*"

Now that Charles had the power, the interests of the Catholic Church and the requirements of justice demanded that he should restore Julius von Pflug to the see of Naumburg, whence he had been driven away in defiance of all law and right; and to execute the sentence of deposition passed upon Herman, Archbishop of Cologne; and having done so, he opened the Diet of Augsburg (September 1, 1547), in the hope of finally bringing about the union so long desired and so frequently attempted, but which he despaired of effecting through a Council which the Protestants had rejected in advance, alleging as an additional excuse for their action that it had been transferred from Trent to Bologna.

By the *famous "Interim" of Augsburg*[1]—the joint production of *Julius von Pflug*, Bishop of Naumburg; *Michael Helding*, coadjutor of Mentz; and the wily and subtle *John Agricola*, preacher to the Elector of Brandenburg—Protestants were permitted to receive the Holy Eucharist under both kinds; the Protestant clergy already married to retain their wives; and a tacit approval given to the retention of property already taken from the Church. This instrument was, from beginning to end, a master-piece of duplicity, and as such satisfied no party. The Catholics of Germany, the Protestants, and the Court of Rome, each took exception to it. Rome complained that the Emperor had acted arbitrarily in thus summarily disposing of purely religious questions; and the Lutherans angrily protested against the proceeding as a "fornication with the whore of Babylon," and, having the invectives of Luther fresher in their memory than his pious exhortations,

[1] It was published by the Emperor May 15, 1548. He also submitted on this occasion a plan of *disciplinary reform* to the bishops present. Formula Reformationis a Carolo V. in Comitiis Augustan. 1548, Statibus ecclesiast. oblata cum commentatione *Ant. Dürr*, Mogunt. 1782. Conf. *J. E. Bieck*, The Triple Interim, Lps. 1721. *J. A. Schmidt*, Historia interimistica, Helmst. 1730.

Hosted by Google

had recourse to every manner of expression to signify their abhorrence of what they styled a work of the Devil, a revival of Papistry, and a new scheme to undermine the pure faith of Protestants (*das Interim hat den Schalk hinter ihm*). *Magdeburg* signified its opposition in a formal protest; and Maurice, the new Elector of Saxony, unwilling to give the *Interim* an unconditional approval, consulted with a number of Protestant theologians, headed by Melanchthon, as to how far he might accept its provisions with a safe conscience. In reply, they drew up what is known as the *Leipsig Interim* (1548), in which they stated that questions of ritual and ceremony, and others of minor importance, which they designated by the generic word *adiaphora*, might be wholly overlooked; and even in points of a strictly doctrinal character, they expressed themselves favorable to concession and compromise. They said, "that, while, on the one hand, man is *justified* solely by the merits of Jesus Christ; on the other, God does not direct his conduct as one might control the movements of a machine. The works ordained of God," they added, "are *good* and *necessary* to salvation, and so are also the three theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity." Confirmation and Extreme Unction, which had but lately been rejected with intemperate haste, they now admitted to be true Sacraments; and they further agreed that *Mass* should be celebrated according to the ancient rite, only stipulating that German canticles should be sung while the solemn act of worship was in progress. It was evident from these concessions that the spirit of Luther was no more; and the German theologians of the Lutheran party, *changing their conduct to suit the changed circumstances in which they found themselves*, were now as docile to imperial authority as they had formerly been servile to the insolent demands of Philip of Hesse.

In the meantime, however, such Lutheran preachers as professed to be faithful followers of their master, made a determined opposition to the "*Interim*," and began a vigorous assault upon its *adiaphoristic* clauses. The *Anti-adiaphorists*, as they were called, were headed by *Flacius Illyricus*, who being an ardent disciple of Luther's, and possessing somewhat of his courage and energy, repaired to *Magdeburg*, whose bold

Hosted by Google

citizens were as defiant of imperial power as they were contemptuous of papal authority. But, in spite of this spirited opposition, the *Interim* was gradually accepted by several Protestant countries and cities, a fact which encouraged the Emperor at the *Diet of Augsburg*, in 1550, to make a final effort to have the Protestants attend the sessions of the *Council of Trent*, again opened by Pope *Julius III.* They, however, once more urged their former claims, demanding that their theologians should be entitled to vote upon all questions; that all former acts and decrees should be declared null; and that the Pope should resign the position of presiding officer. Still, notwithstanding their demands, after a short delay, deputies from Brandenburg, Würtemberg, and Saxony began to appear at Trent; and even the Wittenberg theologians, headed by Melanchthon, were already on their way to the Council, when Maurice of Saxony, having secured all the advantages he hoped to obtain by an alliance with the Catholic party, and regardless of the obligations by which he was bound, proceeded *to betray both the Emperor and his country.* Having received a commission to carry into effect the ban of the Empire passed upon Magdeburg, he was in a position to assemble a large body of troops in Germany without exciting suspicion, or revealing his ulterior purposes. Besides uniting to himself, as confederates in his plot, John Albert, Duke of Mecklenburg; Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg; and William, Landgrave of Hesse, eldest son of Philip of Hesse, he entered into a secret treaty (Oct. 5, 1551) with *Henry II., King of France*, who, as was pretended, coming into Germany as the savior of the country, seized the cities of *Metz*, *Toul*, and *Verdun*.[1] Maurice also

[1] *Scherer*, The Robbery of the Three Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun (*Raumer*, Manual of Hist., New Series, 3d year); *Cornelius*, l. c. (p. 134, n. 3), says that the severe sentence pronounced upon *Maurice* and his confederates was too long delayed. *Buchholz*, Ferdinand I., Vol. VI., p. 477; Vol. VII., p. 23 sq.; *A. Menzel*, Vol. III., p. 411. The following is an extract from the treaty: "Should God favor our cause, we shall do whatever lies in our power to aid him (the King of France) to recover the hereditary provinces of which he has been despoiled (viz., Franche-Comté, Flanders, and Artois). When the election for the Imperial crown takes place, we further pledge ourselves to act in such manner as will be pleasing to his Majesty, and to vote for no one who is not his friend, or who will not give security to maintain amicable relations with him,

Hosted by Google

held out to Henry the prospect of securing the Imperial crown.[1] Everything being in readiness for action, Maurice, advancing through Thuringia, seized the city of Augsburg, and suddenly made his appearance before Innspruck, whence the Emperor, who lay sick of a severe attack of the gout, was hastily conveyed on a litter, through the passes of the mountains, to Villach, in Carinthia. While Maurice was thus making himself master of Innspruck, the King of the French was carrying out his part of the programme by actively prosecuting the war in Lorraine.

Charles V., now destitute of the material resources necessary to carry on a successful campaign against the combined armies of the French King and the German princes, and despairing of putting an end to the obstinate conflict by his personal endeavors, resolved to reëstablish, if possible, his waning power by peaceful negotiations. To this end, he commissioned his brother Ferdinand to conclude the *Treaty of Passau* (July 30, 1552),[2] which provided that Philip of Hesse should be set at liberty,[3] and gave pledges for the speedy settlement of all religious and political differences by a Diet, to be summoned at an early day. It further provided that neither the Emperor nor the Protestant princes should put any restraint upon freedom of conscience, and that all questions arising in the interval between the two parties should be referred for settlement to an Imperial Commission, composed of an equal number of Catholics and Protestants. In consequence of the war then being carried on by the Empire against France for the recovery of the three bishoprics of Lorraine of which the French had taken possession, the Diet did not convene until February 5, 1555. After some discussion, both parties agreed that, *in the existing circumstances*, it

and be in every respect a good neighbor. Should the King himself be pleased to accept the Crown, we shall gratify his wishes in this regard, and give him the preference before any other."

[1] The treaty is given by *Lünig*, Archives of the Empire, Part. Spéc. et Recueil des Traités de paix, T. II., p. 258.

[2] Archives of German Diets, Pars gener., p. 131 sq.; *Hortleder*, Pt. II., Bk. V., ch. 14; *Lehmann*, De Pace religionis acta publica et originalia, i. e. Acts and Protocols of the Peace of Religion, Frankfort (1631, 4to.), 1707, Supplem., 1709.

[3] The Elector had through the Emperor regained his freedom some time before.

Hosted by Google

was impossible to adjust the religious differences, either by mutual conference or by the action of a general council; and that, though reluctantly putting them aside for the present, they conceived it to be their imperative duty to give their whole attention to the restoration of peace and order in the Empire. After a lengthy discussion, the instrument, known as the *Religious Peace of Augsburg*,[1] was accepted as satisfactory to both parties, and it was further agreed that its provisions should have permanent force, irrespective of what might be the ultimate solution of the religious question.

The Religious Peace guaranteed freedom of worship alike to Catholics and to those professing the faith of the Augsburg Confession; but since by the recently introduced *territorial system*, which replaced the more ancient one by episcopates, princes had the execution of this article entirely in their own hands, a precautionary clause was added, providing that any one believing his conscience to be outraged in his own State, should be free to pass to another where his religious convictions and feelings would be respected. It was further provided, that such ecclesiastical estates as had been seized by Protestants during, or previously to, the year 1555, should remain permanently in their possession. But the question which presented the greatest difficulty to a settlement was that known as the *Ecclesiastical Reservation* (*Reservatum ecclesiasticum*), according to which the functionaries and officers of all ecclesiastical estates, which from that time forth might go over to Protestantism, should be deposed and deprived of their dignities, and Catholics chosen to fill their places. Albert of Brandenburg, Herman of Cologne, and many more apostate bishops were quoted as instances to show that the precaution was not only wise, but necessary. This article, which gave occasion to the sanguinary conflicts that followed, was carried through the Diet, by the efforts of Ferdinand, in

[1] Archives of the German Empire, Pars general., p. 131 sq. Pacis compositio inter Principes et Ordines Rom. imperii Catholicos et Protestantes in comitiis Augustanis a. 1555, edita et illustrata a jurisconsulto Catholico, Dilling. 1629. This document in German, and accompanied with many illustrations, was published at Frankfort, 1629, 4to. Conf. *Lehmann*, and see note preceding; also, *Riffel*, Vol. II., p. 751–760.

Hosted by Google

the face of a most determined opposition; and its adversaries, failing to secure its defeat, insisted on having their protest against it inserted in the Treaty of Peace.

Charles V., taught by experience that his hopes of uniting the two religious parties, for the realization of which he had labored so long and so earnestly, were illusory, and that to pursue them further would be useless, resolved to withdraw from public affairs, and to give the remainder of his days to God. He is said to have been influenced in making this decision by the words of an old army captain, who remarked to him on a certain occasion that "one should lay aside the active duties of this life in time to give some attention before dying to the affairs of the next," and accordingly, having assembled the States of the Low Countries at Brussels, October 25, 1556, he formally resigned the Imperial crown. After reading the act of abdication, Charles, rising from his seat and leaning upon the arm of the Prince of Orange, made an address to those about him, in which he recounted, with dignity and pardonable pride, the chief events of his reign, closing with an appeal to his successor, full of parental tenderness and solicitude, urging him to live virtuously, to govern wisely, to respect the rights of his subjects, and to preserve inviolate the faith of the Catholic Church.[1] "I have," said he, "either in a hostile or pacific manner, visited Germany nine times, Spain six times, France four times, Italy seven times, the Low Countries ten times, England twice, and Africa as often. I have made one voyage upon the North Sea, and eight upon the Mediterranean. I have waged many wars, but have always undertaken them more from necessity than inclination. But I have experienced less difficulty in bearing up under these labors and conflicts than I do now in taking leave of you. Still, it must be done; for I feel myself unequal to the task of protecting my subjects, and securing to them that happiness which it is my wish they should enjoy. I had long since made up my mind to resign the crown; but rebellion at home, the French war abroad, and the desire of maintaining inviolate the frontiers of the Empire, then pre-

[1] *Robertson*, Hist. of the Reign of Charles V., New York, 1833, pp. 455, 456. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

vented me from carrying my purpose into effect. And if I now transfer to another the cares of a vast Empire, I am not doing so out of a desire to consult my own ease or to shirk fresh exertions, but because I feel that to retain them would be to act contrary to your interests. Be loyal to the Catholic faith, which has been always and everywhere the faith of Christendom; for should it disappear, the foundations of goodness would crumble away, and every sort of mischief, now menacing the world, reign supreme." Having taken leave of his subjects, he withdrew to the Hieronymite monastery of Yuste, in Estremadura, where he passed two years, dividing his time between experiments with mechanical contrivances, and religious exercises of such extreme asceticism that they sometimes assumed a character of gloomy extravagance, and died September 21, 1558.[1] He suffered much from doubts as to the rectitude of the political motives by which his policy had been guided, and not unfrequently reproached himself with having neglected to employ adequate means at a proper season to secure the peace of the Church and to prevent schism; and with having sacrificed to his temporal interests the paramount claims of the Church.

Documents recently made public throw much light upon the character of Charles, and have quite reversed the popular and erroneous opinions heretofore prevalent concerning this prince. From these it appears that Charles, far from being a man of contracted views and unworthy prejudices, possessed a fine intellect and large and generous sympathies. This is evident, were other proof wanting, from his favorite authors during the early period of his life; for *Thucydides* and *Machiavelli*, *St. Augustine* and *St. Bernard* are not the writers that constitute the delight of small and bigoted minds. His whole life goes to show that he was throughout a most devoted son of the Church; that his faith was firm and undoubting, and his piety earnest and sincere. He was a man of restless activity; courageous in adverse and moderate in pros-

[1] Monastic Life of Charles V., by *Stirling* (German by *Lindau*, Dresden, 1853; by *Kaiser*, Lps. 1853). *Prescott*, Monastic Life of Charles V. (German, Lps. 1857). Cf. *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the end of the fifteenth century, Vol. I., pp. 581, 582. **Gams*, in Moehler's Ch. H., Vol. III., p. 152–154.

Hosted by Google

perous fortune; parsimonious toward himself, he was lavish when any public enterprise demanded a generous expenditure; and, though his life was not spotless, compared with the other princes of his time, he exercised a degree of self-denial which at least kept him within the bounds of temperance and decency, and to which they could lay no just claim. He had two natural children—Margaret of Parma and Don Juan of Austria—the former of whom was born to him before his marriage, and the latter after the death of his wife; but so well was the secret of their illegitimacy kept, that Philip learned that Don Juan was his half-brother only a few days before the Emperor's death.

D.—Development of Protestantism in Switzerland.

§ 321. *Calvin and His Reform at Geneva—Beza.*

Epistolae et responsa, Geneva, 1576, fol. Opera (Genev. 1617, 12 vols. f.); Amsterdam, 1671, 9 vols. f.; in the Corpus Reformatorum, Vol. XXIX. sq. *Calvini, Bezae* aliorumque litterae quaedam, ex autogr. in bibl. Goth., ed. *Bretschneider*, Lps. 1835. (A collection of Calvin's Letters, compiled from the original MSS., and edited, with historical notes, by Dr. Jules Bonnet, were translated into English by *D. Constable*, 2 vols., 1855–1857. The best edition of Calvin's works is that of Amst., 1671, in 9 vols. fol., of which there is an Engl. transl. in 51 vols. 8vo., published at Edinburgh, 1843–1855. Tr.) Œuvres françaises de J. Calvin, précédés de sa vie, par Théod. de Bèze, Paris (two treatises on the state of the soul after death, on the Lord's Supper, etc.) L'histoire de la vie et la mort de J. Calvin, par *Théodore de Bèze*, Gen. 1564. *Bolsec*, Histoire de la vie de Calvin, Paris, 1577, and frequently. *Henry*, The Life of Calvin, Hamburg, 1835 sq., 4 vols. *Staehelin*, John Calvin's Life and Select Writings, Elberfeld, 1861–1863, 2 vols. *Late Researches* in the Protocols of the Council of Geneva concerning Calvin, made by the two *Galiffes*, father and son, Geneva, 1865.—*Viguet* et *Tissot*, Calvin d'après Calvin, Genève, 1864. *Herminjard*, Correspondance des réformateurs (1516–1526), Genève, 1866. †**Kampschulte*, Calvin and his Church and State at Geneva, Lps. 1869 sq. †*Audin*, Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin, Paris, 1841, 2 vols. (The Life of Calvin, by J. M. V. Audin, transl. into English by the Rev. J. McGill, Baltimore and Louisville, 1 vol. 8vo. Tr.) Germ., 2 vols., Augsburg, 1843. Conf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., art. "*Calvin.*" *Hundeshagen*, The Conflicts of Zwinglianism, Lutheranism, and Calvinism in the Church in the territory of Bern, Bern, 1843. *Guizot*, Les vies de quatre grands chrétiens français, Paris, 1873. (See also *Blanc*, Ch. H., Vol. II., p. 275; *Merle d'Aubigné*, Hist. of the Great Reformation; *Chambers'* Cyclop., art. "*Calvin.*" Tr.)

John Calvin, the son of Gerard Calvin, was born at Noyon, in Picardy, July 10, 1509. His father began life as a cooper,

Hosted by Google

but subsequently rose to some distinction, as we hear of him holding the offices of procureur-fiscal of the district of Noyon, and secretary to the Bishop of the diocese. Young John, being destined by his father for the Church, early gave himself to the study of theology, in which his brilliant talents enabled him to achieve such success, that, like Zwingli, he obtained as the reward of his proficiency several ecclesiastical benefices. But cleverness and study can not compensate for a bad character and loose morals, and both the character and morals of Calvin were infamous.[1] Leaving off the study of theology for a time, he went to Orleans, where he gave his attention to law, having as his master the celebrated Père de l'Étoile, one of the most distinguished jurists of that age. The new study does not appear to have had much attraction for him, and he again took up theology. He was chiefly indebted to Père Olivetan, a professor at Paris, and to Melchior Wolmar, a professor at Bourges, for his knowledge of the principles of the Wittenberg school, of which the doctrine concerning justification appears to have made the deepest and most lasting impression upon his mind. While at Paris, his bold and open advocacy of the teachings of Luther drew upon him the ill-will of the Sorbonne, and he was in consequence forced to flee the city, notwithstanding that *Francis I.*, influenced by his sister, Margaret of Navarre, was kindly disposed toward him. Leaving Paris, he led a wandering life for some time, and finally appeared at Basle, in the year 1534, where he attempted to establish his system, and where he wrote his *great work*, "*The Institutes of the Christian Religion*," which he addressed to Francis I.[2] The work became popular in France, and was the means of securing a numerous following to its author.

The inhabitants of the reformed Cantons of Switzerland,

[1] Abbé *Blanc*, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 554 (4th ed., Paris, 1867). (Tr.)

[2] Institut. relig. Christ. ad reg. Franc. (Bas. 1536), Argent. 1539, Gen. 1559, ed. *Tholuck.*, Berol. 1834 sq., 2 P.; ed. *Baum*, *Cunitz*, *Reuss*, Brunsvic. 1869. The Institutes consisted originally of six sections, subsequently of four books, viz: 1. De cognitione creatoris; 2. De cognitione Dei redemptoris; 3. De modo percipiendae gratiae; 4. De externis remediis ad salutem. Conf. *Gerdes*, De Joan. Calv. institut. rel. Chr. (Miscellan. Groeningia., T. II., Pt. I.)

Hosted by Google

repelled by Zwingli's cold and contemptuous views concerning the Lord's Supper, were also inclined to receive with favor the teachings of Calvin, who appears to have been the real founder of the "*Reformed*" denomination in that country. He appealed to *Holy Scripture* more confidently than any other of the reformers, and in his attempts to make its passages fall in with his system and support his peculiar views, surpassed them all in doing violence to the true meaning of the text. But Calvin being a man of fine classical culture, of a philosophic mind, and accurate methods of thought, did not follow the example set him by the Saxon reformers in their insane hostility to all antiquity, and their efforts to banish classic literature and Greek philosophy from the Christian world. Quite the contrary. He was appreciatively grateful for the learning, the eloquence, and the philosophic treasures which, he candidly owned, were contained in the works of the Fathers of the Church and the theologians of the Schools; expressed his admiration of the historians, philosophers, and poets of Greece and Rome; and, in giving his opinion of them, did so with warmth indeed, but also with critical acuteness and judicial fairness. If, on the one hand, he was not always original, and occasionally borrowed thoughts and ideas from Luther; on the other, it must be admitted that he showed much skill in the precision and method with which he developed them. But ideas did not constitute his whole debt to Luther. His language was often quite as *coarse*, *vulgar*, and *blasphemous* as that of the great Saxon reformer.[1]

Geneva was the scene of Calvin's most efficient and important labors. After returning from Ferrara, whither he had gone to visit the Duchess Renée, and where, it is said, there were many well disposed toward him, he passed through

[1] Here is one specimen from many. He wrote two works, entitled respectively "*De aeterna Dei praedestinatione*" and "*De libero arbitrio*," against the clever and learned theologian, *Albert Pighius*, in the former of which he says: "Paulo post librum editum moritur Pighius. Ergo ne *cani mortuo* insultarem, ad alias lucubrationes me converti." Cf. *Linsenmann*, Albert Pighius and his theological views (Tübg. Quart. Review, 1866, n. 4).

Hosted by Google

Geneva. *William Farel* and his associate, *Peter Viret*, who were propagating the new doctrines in the French Cantons of Switzerland, and had been quite successful in their efforts to spread their errors among the people of Vaud, learning that Calvin had arrived in the city, went immediately to see him, and urged him to remain and labor where he was. When the latter demurred, preferring to occupy himself wholly in literary labors, Farel, yielding to his impetuous temper, invoked God's curse upon both him and his studies should he refuse to give himself to the well-being of the church of Geneva, and this menace, Calvin confesses, determined the course to be pursued by him.

Unfortunately, an avenue was opened to the introduction of Protestantism, by an alliance entered into between the Genevese and the Canton of Bern, for the immediate purpose of asserting and maintaining the independence of Geneva against the claims of the Duke of Savoy. Their efforts were successful, and, to more completely alienate them from the Church, the Bishop, between whom and the citizens there was a conflict of authority, quitted the city, and pronounced sentence of excommunication upon its inhabitants. This was the signal for a general movement against the old faith. Altars were pulled down and demolished, paintings and statues destroyed, and of those who continued faithful to the religion of their fathers, some were *imprisoned*, and others *sent into exile*. Thus was the foundation of the new faith laid upon the desecrated altars of the old; and its existence begun among the ruins it itself had made.

Calvin arrived in Geneva in 1536, and soon completed the work which the less energetic Farel and Viret had commenced.[1] But Calvin, like all reformers whose zeal is not tempered by the wise experience of the Church, went to extremes in endeavoring to correct the loose morals of the city, and to bring all under a uniform code of severe and *stern virtue*. He also gave offense by his arbitrary and despotic manner in setting up his new worship (1538). Little by little,

[1] *Mignet*, Introduction of the Reformation, and Organization of Calvinism in Geneva (German, by *Stolz*, Lps. 1843).

Hosted by Google

public opinion began to set strongly against him, till in the end both he and his adherents were expelled the city by the opposition party, who went under the name of *Libertines*, or *Patriots*.

Calvin now took up his residence in Strasburg, where he began to teach theology, and gathered about him quite a respectable community of persons, sharing his peculiar religious views. Here, too, he made the acquaintance of the widow of a converted Anabaptist, whom he married in 1539.

In the meantime, his adherents in Geneva, who were numerous and devotedly attached to him, longed for his return, and at their invitation he again entered that city in 1541, and from that time forth exercised an authority well-nigh absolute in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs. He established a *Consistorial Court of Discipline*, whose office it was to take cognizance of all infractions of morality, among which were included dancing and other amusements. A system of espionage was organized, whose ramifications extended over the whole city, and whose officers invaded the homes and exercised a strict censorship over the social life, and even the speech of individual citizens. While suppressing all houses of public resort previously existing, Calvin allowed five drinking-rooms to be opened, provided they should be kept by *virtuous persons* (*gens de bien*), or, in other words, by Calvinists. The Genevese, acting under the guidance of the *Libertines*, became rebellious under pressure of these restraints on their social customs and habits; but Calvin, acting with his usual promptness, energy, and decision, made such use of the despotic power at his command as effectually kept in check for the time every symptom of revolt. So efficient were his police, that should any citizen be rash enough to give utterance to a sentiment disrespectful to his character, or adverse to his policy, the indiscretion was promptly followed by a punishment so terribly severe that others would carefully guard against repeating the offense.[1] Desirous to make Geneva the Rome of Calvinism, he elaborated a *theocratical* system of

[1] The formula of excommunication drawn up by Calvin, in *Audin*, Life of Calvin, *J. McGill's* tr., p. 314, and in *Kober*, The Ban of the Church, p. 16.

Hosted by Google

church-government, and placed himself at its head, with powers so extensive and prerogatives so extravagant, that even those popularly said to have been claimed by the Popes in the Middle Ages are limited and temperate in comparison. He had *Castellio*, the translator of the Bible, deposed from his office of Regent in the gymnasium, because the latter held certain rationalistic views as to the authenticity of the Song of Solomon; he had the physician, *Bolsec*, banished for assailing the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; he had *Ameaux*, one of the Council of the Twenty-five, cast into prison, because, *it was said*, he had spoken disrespectfully of both the reformer and his reform; he ordered the execution (1548) of *Gruet* for having written words of menace against him, though he himself had given Gruet abundant provocation for the use of intemperate language, by publicly calling him a *dog* at a meeting of the Council. *Gentilis*, who charged Calvin with holding erroneous views on the Trinity, was in consequence condemned to death, and, though escaping the severe sentence for a time by retracting the charge and offering ample apologies, was eventually beheaded at Berne (1566). *Michael Servede*, a Spanish physician, was seized by the despotic orders of Calvin, while passing through Geneva, and burnt at the stake (1553), for having published certain heretical propositions concerning the Trinity. The Libertine, *Berthilier*, underwent a like punishment. It would seem that one who himself explained the mystery of the Trinity so indifferently, and whose views were so vehemently assailed by those of his own sect, should have been a trifle less bloodthirsty toward those who differed from him. These cruel and iniquitous executions, which, as *Bossuet* well observes, were not, as in the case of Luther, the effects of hasty impulse or uncontrollable bursts of anger, but the results of cool, calculating, and unfeeling malignity,[1] have left a stain upon the memory

[1] *Calvini* fidelis expositio errorum Mich. Serveti et brevis eorum refutatio, ubi docetur, jure gladii coërcendos esse haereticos, 1554 (Opusc., c. 686 sq.) *Melanchthon* has left us an elaborate defense (*Consilia* II., p. 204) of the practice of inflicting *capital punishment* on heretics. Writing to Calvin upon the same subject, he says (*Calvini* Epp., No. 187): Legi scriptum tuum, in quo refutasti luculenter horrendas Serveti blasphemias, ac Filio Dei gratias ago, qui fuit

Hosted by Google

of the French Reformer which will never be effaced. Having firmly established his political power at Geneva, Calvin, through the agency of the *Academy* which he founded in that city in 1558, experienced little difficulty in replacing the doctrines of Zwingli by his own in the Helvetic Cantons. The ecclesiastical organization of Geneva became a model for that of other countries, and was adopted by the Reformed churches of France, the Netherlands, England, Scotland, Germany, and Poland.

Calvin's life was one of unwearied activity, and his labors were so numerous and so onerous that his bodily constitution gradually gave way under them. His health began to break in 1561, and, though less active and energetic than formerly, he lingered on till 1564, when he died on the 27th of May. His memory, long held in honor, has gradually fallen into disrepute. At his third *centennial celebration* in 1864, the inhabitants of Geneva refused to acknowledge him either as their national hero or national saint, and, by way of protesting against the celebration altogether, stuck up posters containing the capital sentences against Servede and Berthilier.[1] In 1862, his latest descendant, a citizen of Noyon, of high standing and good character, returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Theodore Beza, Calvin's eulogistic biographer, took up the work of his master, and carried out his designs with energy and ability. Born of a noble family at Vezelai, in Burgundy, June 24, 1519, Beza received an admirable classical education at Orleans, and at the age of twenty gave evidence of his superior ability and attainments by writing brilliant and witty, but indecent verses. He led for some time a life of fashionable dissipation at Paris; but on his arrival at Geneva,

---

βραβευτής (Umpire) hujus tui agonis. Tibi quoque ecclesia et nunc et ad posteros gratitudinem debet et debebit. Tuo judicio prorsus assentior. Affirmo etiam vestros magistratus juste fecisse, quod hominem blasphemum, re ordine judicata, *interfecerunt*. *Beza*, De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis. *Beza* went so far as to insist that the Antitrinitarians should suffer capital punishment even after they had retracted their errors (*Crenii*, Animadversiones, XI. 90). See *Döllinger*, The Church and the churches, the Papacy, and the States of the Church, Munich, 1861, p. 68 sq. *Audin*, Life of Calvin, *McGill's* transl., pp. 413–416.

[1] Cfr. Augsbg. Univ. Gaz., No. 154, June 2, 1864.

Hosted by Google

he came into contact with Calvin, by whose austere severity the natural exuberance of his spirits and levity of his character were so toned down and kept in check, that he gradually assumed an air and demeanor more in harmony with the grave deportment of his master. The result of this self-discipline was a happy mixture of *attractive mildness* and *severe reserve*, which made him acceptable to persons of every degree, and a general favorite among the partisans of Calvinism, of which sect he became the acknowledged head and true founder. Moreover, he brought to the defense of the Calvinistic tenets splendid intellectual gifts and an extensive erudition, and, though unable, owing to the slavish rigorism of the system, to give full play to his mental powers, managed nevertheless to throw into his pages such classic brilliancy of style as gave him a complete advantage over the hostile attacks of the humanists, and notably of Castellio. His felicity in adapting his style to that of the Holy Scriptures is both original and peculiar to himself, and is especially conspicuous in his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul.[1]

§ 322. *Calvin's System.*

Moehler, Symbolism, 5th ed., p. 21; Engl. transl., New York, 1844, pp. 123, 159, 181, 207, 292, 323, 407; *Hilgers*, Theology of Symbolism; *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 698–709; *Hepp*, Dogmatics of the Evangelical Reformed Church, Elberfeld, 1861.

The system of Calvin, as has been intimated above, resembles in its general features the teachings of Luther and Zwingli, though, on the whole, it is far more gloomy and severe. He began to depart from Luther's teaching on the question of *free-will*. Luther denied outright the faculty of free-will in man; Calvin, on the contrary, maintained that man did enjoy a certain sort of free-will, but, at the same time, contended that it was subject to a Divine predestination of a more formal and sterner character than that admitted by either Luther or Zwingli. The one dominating element and

[1] *Fajus*, De vita et obitu Th. Bezae, Gen. 1606; *Schlosser*, The Lives of Theodor Beza and of Peter Martyr, Heidelberg, 1809; *Baum*, Theodore Beza, according to authentic sources, Lps. 1843 sq., 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

distinguishing characteristic of Calvinism is the doctrine of *absolute predestination*,[1] logically and rigorously deduced from his conception of original sin. The decree of predestination, he maintained, is a consequence of Adam's fall, and is, therefore, eternal and immutable. Moreover, the faculties of man are so utterly and radically corrupted and depraved by original sin, that man has an overmastering tendency to do wrong, and can not of himself, though he put forth his best efforts in the attempt, perform a single good action. God, the primordial Author of good and *evil*, had from the beginning set apart a certain number of His creatures, whom He doomed to everlasting punishment, to the end that His justice might be made manifest in them. But that there *might be a pretext* for His wrath and a justification for the punishment, *He caused the First Man to fall into sin*, and visited upon all posterity the consequences of his revolt. Those foredoomed to eternal loss commit sins by a necessity of their being impelled to their commission by the irresistible influence of the Divine will. Their intellect is so blinded by Divine agency and their will so enfeebled, that the one is incapable of knowing and the other equally incapable of performing aught of good. Such expressions as the following are common in the writings of Calvin: Man, acting under a Divine impulse, does what it is not lawful to do—The heart of man, obeying a certain mysterious Divine influence, turns from the good and pursues the evil—Man falls because an overmastering Providence ordains that he shall fall.[2] He further held that the

[1] Calvin professes to base his teaching on that of St. Augustine; but *Petavius* (*Theologicor. Dogmatum*, Tom. I., lib. X., c. 6–15) shows that there is a wide difference between the two. *Hugo Grotius* makes this very just observation on the character of Calvinism: "Nullum potuit in Christianismum inducí dogma perniciosus quam hoc: hominem, qui credidit, aut qui regenitus est (nam haec multis idem valent), posse prolabi in scelera et flagitia, sed accidere non posse, ut propterea divino favore excidat aut damnationem incurrat. Haec nemo veterum docuit, nemo docentem tulisset, nec aliud evidentius vidi argumentum detortae ad privatos et malos sensus scripturae, quam in hoc negotio."

[2] *Calvin*, Institut., lib. IV., c. 18, § 2: "Homo justo Dei impulsu agit quod sibi non licet." Lib. III., c. 23, § 8: "Cadit igitur homo, Dei providentia sic ordinante." Cf. *Moehler*, Symbolism, p. 128. (Tr.) Calvin makes the following commentary on St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans ix. 18: "Nam res externae, quae ad excaecationem reproborum faciunt, illius irae (Dei) sunt instrumenta. *Satan*

Hosted by Google

reprobate, even at the moment he receives the Sacraments, is as destitute of true faith as he is of sanctifying grace. The following is his definition of predestination: "*By predestination*," he says, "*is understood an eternal decree by which God preordains what shall be the lot of each individual.* For, inasmuch as all are not created for the same end, some will enjoy *everlasting happiness*, and others suffer *never-ending misery.* Hence, according as man is created for the enjoyment of the one or the sufferance of the other, he is said to be *predestined either to life or to death.*"[1] Concerning the doctrine of *justification by imputation*, Calvin went a step beyond Luther, declaring that he who believes is not only *perfectly* assured of his justification, but also of his *eternal salvation.* In regard to the *Sacraments*, he differed from Luther, affirming that sanctifying grace has *no connection* with

autem ipse, qui intus efficaciter agit, ita est ejus minister, ut *nonnisi ejus imperio* agat. Corruit ergo frivolum illud effugium, quod de *praescientia* Scholastici habent. Neque enim praevideri ruinam impiorum a Domino Paulus tradit, sed ejus consilio et voluntate ordinari." He is not even at a loss for an illustration in confirmation of his doctrine: "Absalon incesto coitu patris torum polluens detestabile scelus perpetrat: *Deus tamen hoc opus suum esse pronunciat*," etc.

[1] The following is a summary of Calvin's teaching on Predestination, as given by *Blunt* (Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology, London, 1872, p. 102): "The teaching of Calvin on Predestination may be summed up in what are called the *Five Points*, a name given to the peculiarities of his system. These are: Election (and non-election or reprobation); redemption; the bondage of the will; grace; final perseverance. His teaching on these subjects will appear from a statement of his theory on Predestination. He maintained that God not only foresaw, but from all eternity decreed, the fall of Adam, and the total corruption of his posterity by sin; all from birth inherit his fallen nature, with its hereditary bond of sin and guilt, and are in a state of utter alienation from God; free-will Godward is totally lost; man in his natural state can do nothing but sin, and that continually. God is pleased for wise reasons, inscrutable to ourselves and independent of the foreseen merits of the objects of His mercy, to elect some from the fallen race to salvation. They are made willing by this grace, which is irresistible or necessarily effectual, to obey the Gospel call, are regenerated by His Spirit, and live in holiness and obedience to His will, and can not finally fall from a state of grace. The rest of mankind God predestines to eternal destruction, not on account of foreseen sin, though it may aggravate their doom, but in fulfillment of His sovereign purpose or decree. He leaves them in their fallen state without effectual grace, deprived of which they must necessarily perish, as examples of His hatred against sin and for the manifestation of His glory." (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

the visible sign of the Sacrament, and is not invariably efficacious.

His language relative to the *Lord's Supper* and the Eucharistic Presence is insidiously equivocal and purposely obscure. Passages of it would lead one to believe that he is speaking of a true Presence, and a true eating of the Body and drinking of the Blood of Christ, and that he really intends to convey the meaning that the Body of Christ is wholly independent of the faith of the recipient, the unworthy receiving equally with the worthy. But, be this as it may, his teaching is certainly more reasonable and more consolatory than that of Zwingli, according to whom the only Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is that "*which exists in the thoughts of a contemplative mind*," and the only significance of the Sacrament itself, a *remembrance* of Christ, His sufferings, and His death.[1] Calvin, while dissatisfied with the cold and heartless theory of Zwingli, was equally at variance in his teaching with *the Catholic dogma of transubstantiation.* He held that the bread and wine are not changed into the Body and Blood of Christ by the words of consecration pronounced by the priest, but *remain* precisely what they were before the act; that the Body and Blood of Christ are in Heaven, and there alone, but that at the moment of Communion a *Divine power*, emanating from the Body of Christ in Heaven, is communicated to the soul of the *believer.* Thus, according to his conception of the Eucharist, it contained two wholly distinct elements—the one material, which falls under the senses; the other spiritual, which constitutes the *Divine food* of the soul, is communicated only to those *predestined* to eternal life, and is connected with the material element only in so far as the latter is an occasion for its conveyance. Calvin pretended to support this opinion by citations from Scripture, but relied mainly on the words of St. John: "*It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.*"[2]

[1] "Hoc est," said Zwingli (De Vera et Falsa Relig., II., p. 293), "id est, significat Corpus Meum. Quod perinde est, ac si quae matrona conjugis sui annulum ab hoc ipsi relictum monstrans, En conjux hic est meus, dicat." (TR.)

[2] VI. 64. "As regards Calvin's theory (of the Eucharist), though he sometimes uses Catholic phraseology and speaks of Christ being in the 'symbol' (in

Hosted by Google

Finally, *as regards the Church*, Calvin was quite at one with Luther, both doing their best to misrepresent her history, and to picture her as an abyss of infamy, during the period between the first and the sixteenth centuries. But Calvin's views are widely divergent from those of the Wittenberg Doctor concerning the necessity of a distinct body of *ministers in the Church*. The former is clear and definite on this point, maintaining that there shall be three grades in the ministry, viz., Pastors, Elders, and Deacons; and that no one shall assume these offices, unless called of God, *since no man, not having a vocation from God, signified to him through the voice of the people, should take upon him to preach His word and dispense His Sacraments*. Hence, in the system of Calvin, *ordination* has a significance and importance attached to it, of which it is nearly, if not quite, destitute in that of Luther; for while, in the former, it is, in a certain limited sense, called a Sacrament, and should be conferred, not by the body of the people, but by the presbytery, in the latter it signifies no more than a license to preach, granted by the civil power. Calvin further aimed at making the Church more independent of the civil power than did either Luther or Zwingli, his principle being "*Ecclesia est sui juris*"—a principle, however, which he advocated only for a time. In fine, Calvinistic communities were designed to be wholly independent the one of the other, each constituting a sort of little republic in itself; while, in the Catholic system, individual churches are only parts of a grand organism, extending over the whole world, and depending on a central government and a universally-acknowledged Head—the representative of Christ on earth. But in order to unite the individual churches by some sort of bond, Calvin

---

symbolo), and of our being 'partakers of His substance' (participes substantiae ejus); yet it is certain that he wholly rejected the true doctrine of the Eucharist. Thus he asserts that our Lord's human nature can only be present at the right hand of God, and can not, in any sense whatever, be present under Eucharistic signs. . . . Calvin maintained that the Eucharist was especially designed to kindle the believer's faith, and to raise his heart to Christ sitting at the right hand of God. He thus illustrates his theory: That as the sun, though so distant, can infuse light and heat, so Christ, though at the right hand of God, shines into the hearts of the faithful receivers, and fills them with His grace and presence." *Blunt*, l. c., p. 623. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

established *Synods*, which played a much more important part in his than in the Lutheran system. The rigorous exclusiveness of Calvin's opinions, and the inflexible sternness of his character, did not prevent him from stretching a point when he conceived it to be his interest to do so. Thus, for example, he formed a union with the Swiss, when such union seemed necessary for the advancement of his cause; and, in his conference with Dean Bullinger (*Consensus Tigurinus*, 1549), he, like Zwingli, employed language equally hostile to Catholics and Lutherans, saying that it was quite as senseless to affirm either "that the Body of Christ was *under* the forms of bread, or that It was united *with* the bread, as to affirm that *transubstantiation* took place, and that the bread was changed into the body of Christ."[1] To conclude, Calvin, like Zwingli, was the consistent and inveterate foe of all forms, was ardently bent upon abolishing every sort of outward ceremonial, and manifested the most determined opposition to whatever embellishes divine worship, elevates the soul, or warms the heart.

[1] Non minus absurdum judicamus, Christum *sub* pane locare vel *cum* pane copulare, quam panem *transsubstantiare* in corpus ejus.

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER II.

PROPAGATION OF PROTESTANTISM IN EUROPE.

Döllinger treats this subject very fully in the continuation of Hortig's Church Hist., pp. 481–691.

§ 323. *Protestantism in Prussia.*

CHIEF SOURCES.—Chronicles of *Simon Grunau* (a Dominican of Danzig), who was an eye-witness to what he relates. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Encyclopaed., Vol. VIII., pp. 679 sq. French Trans., Vol. 19, p. 266.

The Margrave, *Albert of Brandenburg*, who had been chosen Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in 1511, when he was scarcely twenty-one years of age, early joined the Protestant League. Western Prussia had belonged to Poland since 1466, and the remainder of the country was held in fief of the Polish King, Sigismund, to whom Albert, receiving encouragement from many quarters, refused to render feudal allegiance. Sigismund, in consequence, had recourse to arms to maintain his rights (1519); and Albert, failing to receive the aid that had been promised him, was forced to submit; but, through the friendly offices of the Emperor, a four years' truce was agreed to by both parties, at Thorn,[1] April 5, 1521. The Pope also interposed, and made an effort to effect a reconciliation between Albert and Sigismund;[2] but the former had his mind fully made up to prosecute his plans for independence, and would listen to no overture that in any way interfered with his purpose.

In the year 1522, he traveled into Germany, accompanied by *James of Dobeneck*, Bishop of Pomesania, and *John of Polenz*, Bishop of Samland, both of whom were strongly sus-

[1] *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. VIII., p. 681. Fr. Trans., Vol. 19, p. 268. *Chambers'* Cyclop., Art. Albert, Duke of Prussia. (TR.)

[2] *Petri Bembi*, Epistolae Leonis X. nomine scriptae, lib. I., ep. 22; lib. II., ep. 21.

Hosted by Google

pected of being favorably disposed toward the new religious teachings. He applied for succor to the Diet of Nürnberg, then in session, but was refused (1522), and, having some idle time on his hands, became one of the audience that flocked to hear *Osiander* expounding the new doctrines. From a curious he became an interested and fascinated listener, and, while in this frame of mind, sought counsel of Luther and Melanchthon as to the best way out of his difficulties, and received the advice to return and abolish the *absurd* and *foolish*, as they termed it, Rule of his Order; to take a wife, and make Prussia a secular dukedom. The advice was accepted, and promptly acted upon.

Albert at once began to cast about for Protestant preachers, and in that very year two Lutherans, *John Brismann* and *Peter Amandus*, were formally installed at Königsberg. Monks were driven from their monasteries, and nuns from their convents; the suspected Bishops of Samland and Pomesania publicly declared in favor of Lutheranism (1524); and *Frederic von Heideck*, counsellor to Albert, displayed a singular activity in furthering its interests.

At the expiration of the four years' truce (1525), Albert concluded a treaty of peace at Cracow, with Sigismund, King of Poland, in virtue of which the external portion of eastern Prussia was secured to Albert and his heirs, and the suzerainty of Sigismund over the same territory acknowledged.

When this treaty became known to the provincial Estates of the Duchy, the inhabitants, wearied of the protracted and seemingly inveterate feuds with Poland, received the news with transports of joy; while *Weiss*, who had lately succeeded to the bishopric of Samland, as a proof that his sympathies were with the people, surrendered the temporal administration of his diocese to the reigning prince, assigning as a reason for his action that bishops were called to preach, and not to govern.

To this general transformation of affairs, only one man of name, the Commander of *Memel*, had the courage and manliness to offer any opposition, and even his resistance was but feeble and temporary. The organization of the new church was rapidly pushed forward, and soon completed; a ritual in the

Hosted by Google

Polish language was introduced (1526); and *John Seclusianus* was appointed preacher at Koenigsberg. Duke Albert was solemnly married, in 1526, to *Dorothea*, daughter of the King of Denmark, an act which he intended as a public disavowal of all further connection with either the Teutonic Order or the Catholic Church, and which he attempted to justify in an apology for his conduct, published at the time, and filled with brutal expressions of contempt against the Church he had betrayed and dishonored. The Pope protested against this public and shameless apostasy, and called upon the Emperor to take rigorous measures for the punishment of the crime. The latter at once declared Albert under ban of the Empire, and the Teutonic Order, though stript of its legal rights, offered an emphatic, but vain, resistance; the action of both was frustrated by the insidious course pursued by King Sigismund.

The Confession of Augsburg was adopted by Albert in 1530, who, in order to possess a nursery of Lutheranism within his dominions, founded the *University of Koenigsberg;* and, knowing that neither the Pope nor the Emperor would give it his approval, sought and obtained for it the sanction of the King of Poland. The University soon became the theater of those *theological discussions* which, in the event, proved so disastrous to *Osiander* himself, their chief author, and, after his death, to his followers, called *Osiandrists*, who, on account of their teachings, were banished from every part of Prussia, in 1567.[1]

Albert, not content with his own apostasy, employed every resource of his power to compel his subjects to follow his example. Holding the principle, "*cujus regio, illius religio*," so subversive of freedom and destructive of the rights of conscience, he forced all his States to cease to obey the Church that had raised them from barbarism and ignorance to enlightenment and civilization; and so successful were his efforts, and so complete the alienation of the people from the ancient faith, that, on his death, in 1568, Lutheranism was everywhere predominant, and neither his successor nor any

[1] *Chambers'* Cyclop., Art. Osiander. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

of his subjects thought of returning to the Catholic Church. *Theiner* has attempted to show that Albert's successor eventually embraced the Catholic faith, but his arguments have been successfully refuted and his conclusion proved incorrect by *Voigt*.[1]

§ 324. *Protestantism in Silesia.*

Ehrenkorn, Church History of Silesia, Freistadt, 1713, Pt. I., from ch. 5th, Pt. II. †*Buckisch* (Royal government clerk at Brieg, Imperial Counsellor and Historiographer), Acts of Religion in Silesia, 7 vols. in fol., unhappily still in MSC. This work is the chief source used by *Fibiger* (Master and Prelate of St. Matthew's, Breslau), in writing his Lutheranism in Silesia and the Persecutions suffered by the Roman Catholic Church in Consequence, Breslau, 1712–1733, 3 Pts., 4to. †*Bach*, Authentic C. H. of the County of Glatz, Breslau, 1841. †*Buchmann*, Antimosler, or an Attempt to form a just appreciation of Protestant Silesia under Austrian Domination, Spire, 1843. *Hensel*, Hist. of the Protestant Church in Silesia, Lps. and Liegnitz, 1764. *Rosenberg*, Hist. of the Silesian Reformation, Breslau, 1767. *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. III., pp. 91–96; Vol. V., pp. 238–256, 422 sq.; Vol. VI., pp. 140–144, 220–285. *Döllinger*, The Reformation, etc., Vol. I., pp. 226–273.

Previously to the year 1163, Silesia formed part of Poland, but was, after this date, governed by independent Dukes. *John, King of Bohemia*, skillfully turning to his own advantage the internal dissensions of the country, so directed affairs that, in 1335, nearly the whole of Silesia acknowledged the sovereignty of the Kings of Bohemia. The duchies of Jauer and Schweidnitz and the bishopric of Breslau resisted for a time, but gradually acquiesced—the two former in the year 1392, and the latter in 1442.

While the Lutheran troubles were still at their height, *Louis II.*, the young King of Bohemia and Hungary, perished fighting the Turks at the battle of Mohacz (1526), and his place was supplied by the *Archduke Ferdinand*, brother of Charles V., whom the Bohemians called to the throne of Bohemia, and to whom the wife of his brother, Louis, transferred the crown of Hungary.

The evil influences of the decay of spiritual life and eccle-

[1] *Theiner*, Albert, Duke of Prussia, etc.; his Return to the Catholic Church, a. s. f., Augsburg, 1846. *Voigt*, Letter addressed to Father Augustine Theiner, etc., Koenigsberg, 1846. Conf. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. VIII., p. 700. Fr. tr., Vol. 19, p. 289. But, above all, *Raess*, Converts since the Time of the Reformation, Vol. II., pp. 584–595.

Hosted by Google

siastical discipline, so marked in many countries of Europe during the fifteenth century, and the causes of which are to be sought in the moral degeneracy of the clergy and the worldliness of the bishops, were especially active and conspicuous in Silesia, whose condition was not improved by its alliance with the neighboring country of Bohemia, where the Hussites were disturbing the public peace and distracting individual minds by religious controversy. Thus prepared for religious innovation, Silesia was one of the first countries of Europe to embrace Lutheranism, and the readiness and alacrity with which its inhabitants accepted the new teachings must be mainly ascribed to the depraved morals of the clergy, an admission which is candidly made by *Fibiger*.[1] There is, however, another and a very important cause which goes a long way in accounting for the rapid spread of error in that country, and which deserves special mention. This is the apostasy and faithlessness of a bishop. *John V.*, who was bishop of Breslau from 1506 to 1520, so far forgot his dignity as a man and his duty as a prelate that he opened a correspondence with Melanchthon and Luther, and received from these heresiarchs the following flattering eulogy: "Were there ten bishops like John, the rapid spread of the Gospel in Germany would be assured."

It is said that the Lutheran doctrines were first preached (from 1518) in the territory of Baron Zedlitz, in the Duchy of Jauer, by *Melchior Hoffmann*, an Augustinian monk, who was shortly after joined at Freistadt by *John of Reichenberg*, a friend of Melanchthon's.

At Liegnitz, Duke Frederic II. was the special friend and patron of Lutheranism. In the year 1523 he installed *Valentine Krautwald*, a Lutheran preacher, in the church of St. John, and appointed two of Luther's friends to chairs in the College of Goldberg. But the main cause of the triumph of Lutheranism in Silesia is to be sought in the action of the Municipal Council of *Breslau*, the capital of the province, which at an early day declared openly in favor of the introduction of the new doctrines. In consequence of a difficulty

[1] Cf. Pt. I., ch. 12, pp. 84, 85; *Menzel*, Vol. III., pp. 93 sq.

Hosted by Google

which arose between the Cathedral Chapter and the Council, the latter body banished the vicars of the parochial church of St. Mary Magdalen, and appointed a number of Lutheran ministers to fill their places. In the year 1522 a mob, assembled in the market-place of the city, proceeded to make a mockery of the holy mysteries of religion, to ridicule the ceremonies of the Church, and to deride monks, nuns, and priests by strutting about in their habits and dress and simulating their actions, while the civic magistrates looked on approvingly and gave signs of encouragement. Moreover, the Council drove the Bernardines from their convent, and confiscated this and other property belonging to the Church. King Louis ordered the property thus illegally seized to be restored; but owing to the menacing attitude of the Turks, who were then seriously threatening his States, he was unable to enforce his decree, and it was in consequence disregarded. For a similar reason the efforts of Pope *Hadrian VI.* (ep. die 23 Julii, 1523), of *James, Bishop of Salza* (1520–1539), and Sigismund, King of Poland, to defend the rights and uphold the dignity of the Catholic Church were ineffectual and nugatory.[1] The civic magistrates grew daily more bold and aggressive, and conscious that they could now act without hindrance, forcibly ejected the worthy *Joachim Zieris*, whom the Bishop had appointed Rector of the Church of St. Mary Magdalen, and called to fill his place, under the title of Cathedral Preacher of Breslau, *Doctor Hess* (1523), who had recently proclaimed the Lutheran errors from the pulpit in his native town of Nürnberg. Simultaneously the chaplains of the churches of St. Elizabeth and St. Mary Magdalen were summoned before the Council, and commanded for the future to acknowledge no superior other than Doctor Hess, a command which, in the following year (1524), was extended to all the clergy of the city, with the additional injunction that "they should put aside all human ordinances and the frivolous interpretations of the Fathers," and in their sermons take their new superior as their model. And so cowardly and subservient had the

[1] For details, see *Fibiger*, Pt. I., chs. 5–11, pp. 32–77

Hosted by Google

clergy grown, and so unworthy of their high calling, that among them all, *Doctor Sporn*, Prior of St. Albert's, alone had the manly courage to resist the impertinent demands of the Council, and to say plainly and boldly "*that it was the office of the bishop, and not of magistrates, to give instructions as to the proper method of preaching the Gospel.*" But his outspoken honesty was not appreciated, or rather it was, and he was banished the city in consequence.[1] The bishop did what he could to throw obstacles in the way of the installation of Hess, and made the matter the subject of some clever controversial writings. His efforts obtained probably as large a measure of success as those of any one could, who, holding the office of bishop, was destitute of the gravity, the earnestness, and the firmness so befitting that character. The members of the Council, taking courage from the vacillating weakness of the bishop, went on to commit fresh deeds of violence. The magnificent *convent of the Premonstratensians* on Mount Elbing was razed with the ground (1529), under the frivolous pretext that it might afford a refuge to the Turks, and numerous churches were entered and plundered of their ornaments and precious stones.[2]

The action of Breslau furnished a precedent and example, which was closely followed by the Dukes of Silesia, of whom *Frederic II.*, of *Liegnitz* and *Brieg*, was especially conspicuous for his proselytizing activity.[3] Besides calling in Lutheran preachers from neighboring territories, and installing them at Goldberg and Liegnitz, he gave a general order to all the clergy to preach "*evangelically*," which, failing to do, they were to be deprived of the usual tax heretofore levied upon and paid by the people. With this order, Father *Anthony*, a discalced Carmelite, refused to comply; and for persisting in preaching the Catholic faith, he and the other members of his Order were expelled the country. These so-called Evangelicals entered and pillaged the Catholic churches of *Grossglogau*, and perpetrated deeds of brutal violence upon the

[1] For particulars, see *Fibiger*, Pt. I., ch. 11, 12; and ch. 15, p. 131.

[2] †*Goerlich*, Hist. of the Premonstratensians of St. Vincent's, Breslau, 1836 sq.

[3] *Fibiger*, Pt. I., ch. 14, pp. 118 sq.

Hosted by Google

inhabitants of that city. Scenes equally saddening were enacted at *Schweidnitz* and other cities and towns of the country, and it was not long before Lutheranism was everywhere triumphant.[1]

King *Ferdinand I.* (1526–1564), though ardently devoted to the Catholic Church, and endowed with an energy and strength of character which admirably fitted him to take up her defense, was unfortunately at this time engaged in repelling the aggressions of the Turks, and in consequence unable to oppose any effectual resistance to the advance of Lutheranism. On the other hand, the *bishops*, who should have been the natural defenders of the Church, and who at that very time were in the possession of great political power, having, in 1526, in addition to their other civic offices, become the governors-general of the country, were wholly given up to secular affairs. Influenced by the spirit, and swayed by the passions of the world, they did not bring to the exercise of the functions of their sacred office the steady, energetic earnestness so indispensable to success in such critical seasons; or, what is still more deplorable, they were Lutherans at heart, and would have openly professed the errors they secretly encouraged were they not deterred from doing so by the fear of losing their handsome revenues.[2]

As a rule, the parish-priests were either lazy or corrupt; and being no longer able to look up to those who were set over them as patterns of virtue, or to seek from them the comfort and counsel so necessary to sustain a priest in the performance of the sacred duties of his office, they offered but a feeble resistance to the commands of arbitrary dukes and insolent magistrates. As a consequence, *Von Senitz*, *Dr. Colo*, and *Kupferschmidt* were the only three priests out of all the clergy in the circles of Brieg, Ohlau, Strehlen, and

[1] *Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. V., p. 244 sq.

[2] Concerning the successors in office of James of Saltza, in the See of Breslau, viz: *Balthasar of Pommnitz* (1539–1562); *Gaspar of Logau* (1562–1574); *Martin Gerstmann* (1574–1585); *Andrew Gerin* (1585–1596); *Paul Albert* (1596–1600); *John Sitsch* (1600–1609); conf. *Buchmann*, l. c., p. 9–11; and *Herber*, Silesiae sacrae Origines, p. 82 sq. On the satisfaction of the Protestants at the election of Balthasar Pommnitz, conf. *Menzel*, Vol. III., p. 93 sq.

Hosted by Google

Nimptsch who had the courage to refuse obedience to the orders of Frederic, and who, rather than deny their faith, went into exile.

It was not long till the Lutherans of Silesia began to quarrel among themselves, as they had done in every other country. The doctrines of *justification* and the *Eucharist* were subjects of the liveliest discussion and the widest divergency of opinion. In these controversies *Gaspar Schwenkfeld*, counsellor to Duke Frederic II. and canon of Liegnitz, a man of vigorous and well-trained intellect, took the most conspicuous part.[1]

§ 325. *Protestantism in Poland.* (Cf. § 182.)

M. Lubieniecki, Historia reformationis Polonicae, Freistadt, 1683. Jura et libertates dissidentium in regno Poloniae, Berolini, 1707, fol. *Friese*, Documents for a Hist. of the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania, Pt. II., Vols. I. and II., Breslau, 1786. Vicissitudes of the Reformation in Poland, Hamburg, 1768–1770, III. Pts. *Ostrowski*, l. c. (see Vol. II., p. 246), T. III. *Lochner*, Facta et rationes earum familiar. christianar. in Polonia, quae ab Ecclesia catholica alienae fuerunt usque ad consens. Sendomir. tempora (Acta Soc. *Jablonovianae* nova, Lps. 1832, Tom. IV., fasc. 2). *Krasinski*, Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of the Reformation in Poland, Vol. I., London, 1838 (Germ. by Lindau, Lps. 1841). *Lucaszewicz*, Essay of a Hist. of the Dissenters in the city of Posen and in Great-Poland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Germ. by *Vincent* of *Balitzky*, Darmstadt, 1843).

The introduction of the Reformation into Poland was accompanied by many and serious difficulties, notwithstanding the fact that the country had been in a measure prepared for its reception by the *Hussites* and the *Moravian Brethren*, who had sought a refuge there when fleeing from persecution in other lands. First of all, King Sigismund I. (1501–1548), who was a sincere Catholic, and earnestly devoted to the interests of the Church, put forth every effort to prevent the errors of Protestantism from tainting the minds of the Polish people, whose instincts and sympathies were then, as they have been in every age since their conversion to Christianity, deeply and intensely Catholic.[2] Learning that the young

[1] This subject will be treated in detail in § 341.

[2] Conf. Agenda secundum Rubricam eccl. Metropol. Gnesnen. edit. 1508, Cracoviae, which had been in use long before Luther lived.

Hosted by Google

Poles, who had made their studies at Wittenberg, following the example set them by the young men of other countries, had brought home with them some of the writings of Luther, and were industriously engaged in scattering them among his subjects, he at once took every possible precaution to stop the spread of these mischievous publications. It was enacted at the Diet of Thorn (1520) that no one should have the writings of Luther in his possession. The efforts of Sigismund to preserve the purity of faith in Poland were ably seconded by *John Laski*, Archbishop of Gnesen († 1531), and *Andrew Krzycki*, Chancellor to Queen *Bona*, and subsequently Bishop of Przemysl (1524), both of whom were among the most zealous defenders of Catholic doctrine in that age.[1] A commission was also appointed to make search for and confiscate all heretical books. But, in spite of all these measures, Protestantism found its way into the *University of Cracow*, where it was introduced by *Martin Glossa*. It was preached at *Posen* by *John Seclusian*, who first published in print[2] a *complete* translation of the New Testament in the Polish language (1551–1552), and at *Danzig* by the monk *Jacob Knade* (1518), through whose exhortations a number of the burghers were led to ask to be formally instructed in the new teachings. Knade, though obliged to flee from the anger of an indignant people, was soon brought back to the city by his partisans. Others of the Lutherans did not fare so well. Some of the more intemperate were put to death, and some received orders to quit the city within a fortnight; while monks and nuns, who had broken their vows and married, were commanded to be away within twenty-four hours. The only effect of these measures was to excite the passions of the inhabitants, who now expressed themselves with so much

[1] Consult above all the Diocesan Statutes, and the very old collection of them by *John Laski*, and another by *Stanislaus Karnkowski*, both of which have been arranged in five books and edited by *Wenzyk*, Cracow, 1630.

[2] We say advisedly "*in print*," for even as early as the fourteenth century Polish authors make mention of translations of various portions of the Bible into their language. They specify the Psalter, and in fact nearly every book of both the Old and New Testaments. Cf. *le Long*, Bibliotheca sacra in binos syllabos distincta, etc., Paris, 1723, fol., Sectio III., Biblia Polonica, p. 439 sq.

Hosted by Google

vehemence in favor of the new teachings that the king, fearing they might rise in revolt and make themselves masters of the city, thought it prudent to adopt more moderate counsels. From Danzig Lutheranism was carried to the cities of *Thorn* and *Elbing*. To prevent the further spread of error, it was enacted at the Synod of *Petrikau* that the followers of Luther should be arrested and brought to trial, and such measures taken against them as would effectually repress the heresy. One of these was a prohibition forbidding any one to hold public office in Poland who had made his studies at Wittenberg. The decree, however, was never rigorously enforced.

But, in spite of this vigorous opposition, Protestantism, protected and encouraged by a free-thinking nobility, steadily gained ground, and at the death of Sigismund I. had invaded many of the provinces of Poland. To add to the strength, and swell the number of the Polish Protestants, in the succeeding reign of *Sigismund Augustus II.* (1548–1572), a large body of *Bohemian Brethren*, who had been sent into exile by King Ferdinand, arrived at Posen. But the citizens soon tired of their presence, and the exiles again setting out on their pilgrimage, directed their course toward *Marienwerder*, in West Prussia.

It soon appeared that the new king's opposition to the teachings of Protestantism was vacillating rather than decided, and feeble rather than energetic; and in consequence Poland became the asylum where sectaries of nearly every conceivable shade of opinion sought refuge. Thither flocked *Bohemian Brethren* and *Lutherans*, *Reformed Christians* and *Unitarians* (Socinians), from Switzerland and Italy. Among these last, the most prominent were the Franciscan, *Lismanin*, confessor to Queen Bona, and *John of Lasko*, whose name was well known in England.

Prince *Radziwill* of Lithuania, a zealous member of the Reformed Christians, following the example of the Lutherans, had a translation of the Bible made into the Polish language, according to the sense of his own sect, and published in 1563.[1]

[1] The first *printed* edition of the New Testament published by Catholics was

Hosted by Google

In 1555 a "*national Synod*," composed of delegates from every province, and presided over by the king, was held at Petrikau, when it was determined to arrange for a conference of Catholic bishops and Protestant divines, to which *Melanchthon*, *Lasko*, *Calvin*, and *Beza* were to be invited, and a symbol of faith drawn up, which should embrace general principles recognized by all, and ignore such teachings as some would not accept.[1] The king, strange to say, approved the action of the "Synod," and requested Pope *Paul IV.* to authorize the Mass to be said in the Polish language, to permit Communion to be taken under both kinds, to give priests leave to marry, to sanction the convocation of a *national council*, and to abolish the payment of annats. These requests, as might have been foreseen, were denied. The danger which threatened the Catholic Church grew daily more grave and alarming. The Polish nobles, thoroughly rationalistic in principle, and thoroughly Protestant in sympathy, and exercising over the minds of their serfs a supremacy as complete in the spiritual order as that which they exercised over their bodies was in the material, alienated these poor people from the Church, though nothing could have been more unnatural to the Polish heart, or more revolting to Polish instincts, than the principles of the Protestant religion.

But the fierce quarrels, which here as elsewhere broke out among the Protestant sects directly on their securing the ascendancy, alarmed the country; and thoughtful people began to foresee that if the principles of Protestantism became active in the national life, the unity of Poland would be shattered, and its very existence as a kingdom threatened. To avert so great a disaster, the Protestant sects, each differing from and antagonistic to all the rest, but all harmonizing in their rancorous hostility to the Catholic Church, met in

brought out in 1556 at Cracow, by *Scharfenberger*. A complete translation of the Bible (by John Leopolita) appeared at Cracow in 1561. The translation by the Jesuit, *John Wujek*, was issued between the years 1593 and 1599, and was accompanied with the Hebrew and Greek texts, and supplemented with commentaries intended to elucidate difficult passages and to furnish arguments for the defense of the Catholic faith against the attacks of heretics.

[1] *Lukaszewicz*, Hist. of the Ref. Church in Lithuania, Lps. 1848, I. Vol.

Hosted by Google

council at *Sandomir* in 1570, and drew up and signed a symbol, couched in terms so general and indefinite that each might accept its articles and yet have the fullest liberty to believe what they liked.[1] Deriving a fictitious strength from this union, they were able, during the interregnum which followed the death of Sigismund Augustus, to conclude a religious peace, called the *Peace of the Dissidents* (*Pax dissidentium*, 1573), which set forth that Catholics and *Dissidents* were to remain forever at peace with each other, and both to enjoy equal civil rights. *Henry of Valois*, the newly elected king, was compelled to take oath that he would maintain the conditions of this Peace. He shortly returned to France, and *Stephen Bathory*, Prince of Transylvania (1575–1586), was chosen in his room. Among the intimate friends of this prince were many Catholics of ability and learning, who exercised no little influence upon his mind. But while manifesting a more commendable zeal in the Catholic cause than any of his immediate predecessors had done, he yet refused to take any definite and decided step, feeling himself bound to respect the secret treaty (1557) of Sigismund Augustus, granting freedom of conscience and worship to three cities of Danzig, Thorn, and Elbing, whose inhabitants were long known to be favorably disposed toward Protestantism. But a severer trial and more threatening danger were yet to come upon the Polish Church. *James Uchanski*, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, publicly favored Protestantism, and exerted himself to bring about a rupture with Rome. This attempt to alienate the Court of Rome and the Polish nation, had it been completely successful, would have been followed by consequences the most disastrous, and rendered the stay of the Papal Legates, *Lippomani* (since 1556) and *Commendone*, in the country extremely difficult.

The hopes of the Catholic party were revived, and their influence among the nobles augmented, by the accession of *Sigismund III.*, heir to the crown of Sweden, to the throne of Poland (1587–1632); and, as a consequence, a very decided

[1] *Jablonski*, Hist. consensus Sendomirensis, cui subjicitur ipse Consensus, Berol. 1731, 4to.

Hosted by Google

reaction set in against Protestantism. Moreover, God raised up to Himself at this time priests eminent alike for their piety, their learning, and their zeal, such as *Stanislaus Hosius*,[1] Bishop of Ermeland († 1579), through whose energetic resistance the ravages of heresy were stayed, and through whose purity of faith and holiness of life the Poles were encouraged and strengthened to cling to the belief of their fathers. The learning, the conflicts, and the triumphs of this holy bishop were such that his name was held in honor by the universal Church, and he was selected, after he had become cardinal, to preside for a time over the Council of Trent, where he was acknowledged to be one of the ablest of the great theologians who constituted that body. His polemical writings are among the very best of that age, and his exalted virtues and apostolic zeal are still gratefully commemorated at the *Lyceum Hosianum* of Braunsberg, which bears his honored name.

Another Catholic champion, equally distinguished for learning, eloquence, and living, energetic faith, was *Stanislaus Karnkowski* († 1603), Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland,[2] who, with the frankness of a saint and the fearlessness of an apostle, wrote in the following words to Sigismund Augustus: "Emulate the example of thy father and the piety of thy ancestors in preserving inviolate in thy kingdom, no less than in thy own heart, the old faith, the ancient Catholic religion."

These confessors of the faith were ably seconded in their labors by the *Jesuits*, whose Order had spread rapidly, and was now firmly established in Poland, and under whose direction a large number of colleges had already passed. Among the Polish Jesuits, whose names came most prominently forward during the conflict against Protestantism, *James Wujek*

[1] *Stan. Hosii*, Cardin. Major. Poenit. et episcopi Varm., vita auctore Stan. *Rescio*, Rom. 687. His principal work is Confessio fidei—verae chr. catholicaeque doctrinae solida propugnatio ctr. Brentium (1557). Cf. †*Eichhorn*, Cardinal Hosius, Bishop of Ermeland, Mentz, 1854, 2 vols. Constitutiones Synodales dioeceseos Varmiensis, Brunsbergi, 1612, 4to.

[2] His exertions to have the *Roman Catechism* translated into Polish are worthy of all commendation. Apart from his *Diocesan Statutes*, his fame rests chiefly upon his sermons on the *Eucharist* and the *Messiah;* the former published at Cracow in 1602, and the latter at the same place in 1597.

Hosted by Google

(*Vangroviecensis*) deserves special mention for his zeal, ability, and untiring activity. Having completed his philological and scientific studies at the universities of Cracow and Vienna, and taught mathematics for a time at Rome, he entered the Society of Jesus in the year 1565. In after years he passed much of his time in the colleges of *Posen*, *Clausburg*, and *Cracow*, and acquired no little celebrity as a preacher and controversial writer.[1] His translation of the Bible into the Polish language, which he made at the request and under the patronage of *Stanislaus Karnskowski*, Archbishop of Gnesen, is a work of great merit, and even at this day enjoys the special distinction of being the only one approved by the Church of Poland († June 27, 1597).

There were also three others belonging to Religious Orders who played a prominent part in the religious affairs of Poland during these years. The first was *Peter Skarga*,[2] a Jesuit. He was a good theologian, possessed a clear, well-trained, and vigorous mind, and was solidly erudite. He was, moreover, a skillful, eloquent, and powerful speaker, and as his dogmatical and controversial sermons, replete with patristic lore, amply attest, the greatest preacher whom Poland has ever produced († 1612). The next was *Fabian Birkowski*,[3] a Dominican, and Skarga's successor as preacher to the Court of Cracow. He is remembered chiefly by his sermons for Sundays and Holydays, which are quite numerous, and portions of which are not unfrequently quoted as models of impassioned eloquence († 1636). The third was *Martin Bialobrzeski*,[4] abbot of the convent of Mogilno and suffragan bishop of Cracow, who, through his homilies, modeled after those of St.

[1] Postilla major, and minor (in Polish). De missa et Deitate Verbi divini contra consens. Sendomir. Vita et doctrina Salvatoris ex quatuor evangel. De ecclesia cathol.—Hymni.

[2] Sermons, new edit., Lps. 1843. Extracts from Baronius, Rocyne-dzieje koscielne, etc., Cracow, 1603, fol., continued from 1198 to 1645, by *Kwiatkiewicz*, Kalisz, 1695, fol. Lives of the Saints; on the reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches (in Polish); libb. III. dissertationum de Eucharistia.

[3] Sermons for the Sunday and Feast days, in two series, 1620 and 1628.

[4] Postilla orthodoxa, 1581, 2 vols., shortly after translated into German. Catechismus, Cracoviae, 1666, 4to. (387 pages). These two works are written in Polish.

Hosted by Google

John Chrysostom, became the great popular preacher of Poland. He was also the author of a *Complete Catechism*, which is a master-piece of its kind, and did much to foster among the clergy a taste for imparting Christian instruction, of which the young are always in so much need, and by which they profit so largely († 1585). In the meantime, the Protestants of Poland, who had been treated with unusual kindness, incited by theologians at home and princes abroad, carried themselves with all the insolence of superiors and the haughtiness of conquerors, and have left upon record very exaggerated accounts of the cruelties they claim to have endured, of the measures taken against them by Sigismund III., and of the policy pursued by the Jesuits, which, it must be admitted, sometimes bordered on severity. The rupture between the Catholics and Dissidents finally became complete and irreparable. These dissensions were deplored by *Ladislaus IV.* (1632–1648), one of the most worthy princes of his age, with the keen grief of a father sorrowing over the alienation of different members of his own family. He appealed, but in vain, to the Poles to come together at the *Religious Conference of Thorn* (1644), and there devise measures which might make them once more a united people. His motives were misconstrued; and even had his words been listened to and acted upon, they could hardly have averted from Poland the disasters with which that country was threatened.[1]

§ 326. *Protestantism in Livonia, Courland, Esthonia, Hungary, and Transylvania.*

Under the Grand-Master, *Walter of Plettenberg* (1521), Livonia severed its connection with the Teutonic Order. In order to escape the authority of the Archbishop of Riga, who showed a stubborn constancy in defending the prerogatives of his office and maintaining the rights of the Catholic Church, Walter embraced Protestantism, thinking this the surest way to a triumph over the archbishop and his clergy. This was the origin of the Protestant communes of *Riga*

[1] Cf. § 354.

Hosted by Google

(1523), *Dorpat*, and *Reval*, all of which joined the Schmalkaldic League. When at length William, Margrave of Brandenburg, and brother to the Duke of Prussia, became Archbishop of Riga, the whole of Livonia passed under the influence of Protestantism.[1] Lutheranism was introduced into Courland by *Gothard Kettler*, Grand-Master of the Teutonic Order, who in 1561 assumed the title of Duke of Courland and Semgallen, ceding to Poland that part of Livonia lying beyond the Dwina, on condition that the inhabitants should be permitted to profess the Augsburg Confession. The defection of Courland was precipitated by the conduct of *John of Moennighausen*, bishop of that country, who sold his see to the King of Denmark for the sum of thirty thousand thalers (1559), and, retiring to Germany, embraced Protestantism and took a wife.[2]

The students from Wittenberg were chiefly instrumental in introducing Protestantism into *Hungary*.[3] At the request of the Catholic clergy, severe laws were enacted against the Lutherans by the Diet of Pesth in 1525. But amid the universal decay of ecclesiastical institutions, the clergy neither commanded the respect nor possessed the authority requisite to successfully uphold the declining fortunes of the Church. As a consequence, five royal free-cities of Upper Hungary, viz., *Leutschau*, *Seben*, *Bartfeld*, *Eperies*, and *Kaschau*, declared in favor of Lutheranism at the Synod of Eperies. Moreover, owing to the death of the king, who perished in the disastrous battle of Mohacz in 1525, the approach of the Turks,

[1] *Tetsch*, Ch. H. of Courland, Riga, 1767–1777, three parts. An abridgment of it is found in *Nova Acta* hist. eccl., T. VIII., p. 649 sq., T. X., p. 865, 1721, and in *Acta* hist. eccl. nostri temporis, T. II., p. 456 sq., 1711 sq.

[2] *Schloezer* and *Gebhadi*, Hist. of Lithuania, Livonia, and Courland, Halle, 1785, 4to.

[3] *Lehmann*, Hist. diplomatica de statu rel. evang. in Hung. 1710, fol. Hist. eccles. reform. in Hungaria et Transsylvania (auct. *P. C. Debrecen*) acces. locuplet. a *F. A. Lampe*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1728. Memorabilia August. confess. in regno Hung. a Ferd. I. ad Carol. VI. recens. *Joan Ribini*, Poson., 1787–1789, 2 T. Cf. *Engelhardt*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 217. *Joh. Szeberinyi*, Corpus maxime memorabil. synodorum evangelic. Augustan. confession. in Hungaria, Pesthini, 1818.

Hosted by Google

and the prevalence of civil discord, it was found impossible to carry into effect the decrees of the Diet of Pesth.

While the two kings, Ferdinand of Austria and John Zapolya, were engaged in making war upon each other, the nobles availed themselves of the opportunity to seize the estates of the vacant bishoprics, and secured their plunder by going over to Protestantism. The most active agent of Protestantism in Hungary at this time was *Matthias Devay*, who, having at first professed Lutheranism, became a Zwinglian in 1543, and in 1545 held a sort of synod at *Erdoed*, in the county of Szathmar, at which twenty-nine ministers assisted. In the year 1548, the *Diet of Presburg*, in the name of the King and the estates, issued an edict for the suppression of heresy and the maintenance of the true faith, but it failed of its purpose; and Protestantism, enjoying the patronage and protection of *Thomas Nadasdy*, the new Palatine (since 1544), steadily gained ground, until its progress was retarded here as elsewhere by dissensions among the sectaries themselves. Some, relinquishing the profession of the Augsburg Confession, embraced the teachings of Zwingli, while others preferred the sterner tenets of Calvin. The Synod of *Tarczal*, held in 1563, adopted the Symbol of Beza, and commanded that the instruction given to the people concerning grace and predestination should be based upon the teachings of Calvin.

Calvinism was soon the predominant religion of Hungary, and its adherents, assembled at the Synod of *Czenger*, spoke of the Lutherans as a carnal and stupid set, who taught that the Eucharist was a bloody and cruel sacrifice. The Lutherans, on the other hand, declared at the Synod of *Bartfeld*, held in 1594, that the solution of all theological difficulties was to be sought in the writings of Luther, which were also the last resource in deciding the merits of theological discussions.

The virtuous *Nicholas Olahi*, Archbishop of Gran, and the *Jesuits*, who had been established at the college of Tyrnau since 1561, were especially conspicuous for their vigorous and manly defense of the Catholic faith. On the 10th of April, 1560, a *Synod* held at *Tyrnau* decreed that all ecclesiastical property in the possession of laymen should be restored to

Hosted by Google

the Church. The destruction of the college of the Jesuits by fire temporarily suspended their labors in Hungary, which they quitted in 1567, but only to come back again in 1586.

The new doctrines were introduced into Transylvania by some merchants of Hermannstadt, who had picked them up at Leipsig, where they passed a portion of the year 1521, and by two Silesian preachers, who proclaimed them publicly through the country. In 1523 severe measures were enacted to prevent the spread of the new errors, but nothing came of them; and in the following year a Lutheran school was set up at Hermannstadt, while in the meantime the nobles displayed their zeal by seizing the property of the Church.

After the battle of Mohacz, which was no less disastrous to Transylvania than to Hungary, the Protestants grew more bold and aggressive, and the authorities of Hermannstadt drove the monks from their monasteries and expelled them and all other Catholics from the town (1529). *John Honter* preached with great applause at Kronstadt, and spread everywhere the teachings of Luther. It was not long before the Mass was abolished in many parts of Transylvania, and Communion distributed under both kinds (1542). The fathers assembled at the *Synod of Mediasch* were afflicted to learn that the nation of the Saxons, invited into the country by King Geisa II. in the twelfth century, had unanimously declared their profession of the Augsburg Confession. The Magyars also declared in favor of the Reformed, while the Wallachians remained united to the Greek Church. During the contest for the crown of Hungary, in 1556, the provincial Diet of Klausenburg granted the fullest freedom of religious worship. Disorder and confusion were now at their height. The Lutherans were straining themselves to the utmost to crush the adherents of the Reformed Church; and the Unitarians, while fleeing persecution in other lands, and seeking a refuge here, added another element to the existing chaos, by demanding equal rights with other religionists, which were granted them by the provincial Diet of *Maros Vasarhely* in 1571.

The first complete translation of the Bible, made upon the Vulgate and the version of Luther, was edited by *Gaspar*

Hosted by Google

Heltai, a Lutheran preacher of Klausenburg, and appeared in 1562. A second, the work of *Gaspar Karoly*, a preacher of Goenz, corrected by *Abraham Molnar*, a Reformed preacher, was published in 1589.

§ 327. *Protestantism in Sweden.*

Olai Petri Swenke Krönica (Olai Petri's Swedish Chronicle), ed. *Klemming*, Stockholm, 1860 (to 1520). *Baaz*, Inventarium eccl. Sueco-Gothor., Lincop. 1642, 4to. *Messenius*, Scandia illustrata, Stockholmiae, 1700, 8 vols., fol. *Fr. Rühs*, Hist. of Sweden, Halle, 1805–1814, 5 vols., especially Vols I. and II. *Geijer*, Hist. of Sweden, Hamburg, 3 vols. †**Aug. Theiner*, Sweden and Her Relation to the Holy See, under John III., Sigismund III., and Charles IX., according to secret State-papers, two parts, Augsburg, 1838–1839 (the second part contains a collection of pieces, filling 350 pages). *Clarus*, Sweden Once and Now, 2 vols.

By the celebrated treaty, known as the *Union of Calmar* (1397), the supreme government of the three northern kingdoms of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark was placed in the hands of the Danish kings, who, it was provided, were to be chosen by delegates representing these three countries. It was hoped that this measure would unite the three kingdoms, give them common interests and common aspirations, but subsequent events showed the hope to be fallacious. Instead of removing it fostered old, and was the prolific source of new jealousies, and caused ancient national hatreds to burn with fresh and increased violence.

Bloody conflicts followed, which, while diminishing respect for the throne and weakening its authority, *extended the influence and augmented the wealth of the nobility and the clergy*. The clergy, however, used their power humanely. Their rule was mild and benevolent, and religion flourished among the people no less than among the nobility and the ecclesiastics.

The Swedes were devotedly attached to the Supreme Head of the Church. Their religious feasts, such as those they celebrated conjointly with the Finns at Abo in 1513, and at Linkoeping in 1520, on the occasion of the public announcement of the canonization of their countrymen, *Hemming* and *Nicholas*, they regarded as national festivals.

Politically, these people were not equally happy. The

Hosted by Google

noble and courageous *Sten Sture*, the Younger, while at the head of the Swedish government, made an effort to throw off the yoke of Denmark, but being already involved in a quarrel with *Trolle*, the perfidious Archbishop of *Upsala*, he was at a disadvantage, and was beaten by *Christiern II.* of Denmark in 1519. No sooner had Christiern been crowned King of Sweden by Trolle than he gave orders for the terrible massacre of Stockholm, which was continued from the 8th to the 10th of November, 1520, and in which, besides a host of others, ninety-four Swedish nobles perished. The subserviency of Trolle was rewarded with the office of Regent of Sweden. Among the victims of these fatal days was the father of the intrepid *Gustavus Ericson* of the house of *Wasa*, who, while still young, had been given up as a hostage to Christiern. Having made good his escape from his own country, Gustavus sought an asylum at Lübeck, where he was kindly received, and after obtaining substantial assistance from the municipal authorities, again returned to Sweden; and, calling upon his countrymen to rise and assert the freedom of their country, he put himself at their head, met and defeated the Danes, and, amid universal enthusiasm, was proclaimed Administrator of the State in 1521, and two years later chosen King of Sweden by the Diet of Strengnaes. In order to avert from his country the periodical evils and political agitations incident to elective monarchies, Gustavus exerted himself to make the succession in Sweden hereditary. His familiarity with the teachings of Luther, with which he had become acquainted during his stay at Lübeck, greatly facilitated the execution of his project. He publicly declared his hostility to the episcopacy and the ancient nobles of the land, and avowed his intention of establishing a new Church and creating a new nobility. "He would not suffer himself to be crowned," he said, "until he had abolished the Catholic episcopacy and subverted the ancient Church." Among his most active and energetic assistants in bringing about these changes were the brothers *Olof* and *Lawrence Peterson*, both of whom had made their theological studies at Wittenberg, and returned to Sweden in 1519. The former was the most distinguished preacher of Stockholm, and the latter held a profess-

Hosted by Google

orship at Upsala. *Lawrence Anderson*, Archdeacon of Strengnaes, and subsequently Chancellor to Gustavus Wasa, became the patron of the Peterson brothers, whose teachings he embraced. Such of the people and clergy as offered any resistance were made to submit by force; bishops who, like *John Braske* of Linkoeping and *Peter Jakobson* of Westeraes, as also *Knut*, Provost of the Cathedral, preferred fidelity and duty to apostasy, were deposed and deprived of their dignities, while the Dominicans were banished the country.

Gustavus, while thus putting forth his best efforts to destroy the Catholic Church in Sweden, cunningly concealed his real intentions from John Magnus Gothus, the Papal Legate, and in numerous letters, addressed to Pope Hadrian VI., simulated a sincere attachment to the Catholic faith. To the latter he wrote as follows: "In order to extirpate as speedily as possible the dangerous teachings of the Hussites, which a certain Augustinian monk, called Luther, is again reviving and attempting to spread, thereby imperiling the public peace, we have forbidden all our subjects individually, under penalty of loss of goods and even life, either to propagate the teachings of the said Luther, to introduce his writings into our States, to buy them, to sell them, or to make any use whatever of them." Gustavus, however, arranged a public *Discussion* to take place at Upsala between *Olof Peterson* and *Peter Galle*, in the course of which very nearly the same propositions that had been discussed at Leipsig were controverted and defended. Like Luther, Olof, who had little knowledge of Church history, put whatever interpretation upon Holy Scriptures best suited his purpose, and finding himself driven to absurdities by his own concessions, had recourse to intemperate language and personal abuse.

Desirous of despoiling the Church of her wealth, and feeling that the iniquitous proceeding needed some justification, Gustavus sought a sanction for his conduct in arguments drawn from Luther's tract "*On the Confiscation of Ecclesiastical Property*," and charged the professors of the University of Upsala, who by this time had all become Lutherans, with the congenial work of defending the sacrilegious robbery. When

Hosted by Google

the royal commissioners presented themselves, the Archbishop of Upsala protested against their violence, and the inhabitants of the city took up arms and rushed to his defense. The wily monarch, under a specious pretext, decoyed the archbishop to the royal palace, where he amply atoned for the crime of being the object of the admiration and love of his people. While other pastors and the inferior clergy were allured into keeping silence by seductive but fallacious promises, *the cloistered nuns of Wadstena*, though subjected to acts of brutal violence, made a most determined and heroic resistance. Pope Clement VII. called upon the king to desist from plunder and outrage, but his voice fell upon ears deaf to the accents of justice or sorrow.

Magnus Knut, the Archbishop-elect of Upsala, and *Peter Jakobson*, Bishop of Westeraes, were condemned to death on the specious pretext of having incited and encouraged the inhabitants of the valleys in their hostility to the king. Their persons were subjected to the vilest indignities before and their bodies after execution. A crown of straw was placed upon the head of Jakobson and a mitre of bark upon that of Knut; both were placed upon half-starved horses, with their faces toward the tails, and in this ignominious condition conducted through the city to be scoffed at by the multitude. After their execution, their bodies were torn upon the wheel, and then cast out to be devoured by birds of prey (February, 1527). At the Diet of Westeraes (1527), where the two parties confronted each other, and manifested feelings of furious hostility, Gustavus, feigning much sorrow and great distress on account of the sad condition of affairs, professed his inability to govern under the circumstances, and declared his intention of abdicating. The artifice was clever and successful. The fear that, if the king should carry his threat of abdicating into execution, the country would lapse into anarchy, had its effect upon the Diet. The property of all bishoprics, convents, and cathedral-chapters was made over to him, and the nobles were authorized to take possession of all lands which their ancestors, as far back as the year 1453, had bestowed upon the clergy. As a consequence, the Church in Sweden was reduced to a condition of utter destitution.

Hosted by Google

Gustavus, feeling that the moment was now come when he might throw aside all disguise, publicly proclaimed that it was necessary to go back to the true word of God, which, he added, the new teachers were announcing. The Reformation was forthwith inaugurated by the adoption of a *liturgy in the vulgar tongue* and the abolition of the rule of clerical celibacy.[1] When these preliminary measures had been fully carried out, the formal establishment of the Reformation was accomplished by the *Assembly of Oerebro* in 1529. In the year 1531 the archiepiscopal see of Upsala was conferred upon Lawrence Peterson, who then took a wife, and, being not wholly insensible to the fascinations of this world, had the good taste to select one of noble lineage.

It was not long, however, before Peterson and the new teachers began to experience some of the humiliation and bitterness consequent upon having a despot like Gustavus for their master. He told them plainly "that priests should not carry themselves like lords, and that if they should ever attempt to wield the sword, he knew of a very summary way of preventing them."

On the other hand, the leaders of the Reformation, Olof Peterson and Lawrence Anderson, made personal attacks upon the king in their sermons, and entered into *a conspiracy against his life.* The plot was discovered, and its authors condemned to death by the Estates of Oerebro (1540), a penalty which they escaped only by the payment of a heavy fine. In addition to this, Anderson was deprived *forever* of his office and dignity, and, withdrawing into obscurity, died in 1552 at Strengnaes, the very city in which he had first raised the standard of revolt against the Catholic Church, forsaken by his friends and despised by every one else. In the year 1544 the *Diet of Westeraes* at length made the crown of Sweden hereditary upon Gustavus and his male issue.

[1] *Roemer*, De Gustavo I. rer. sacr. in Suecia saec. XVI. instauratore, Ultraj. 1840. The Aulic Chapel, dedicated in honor of *St. Nicholas*, still bears the inscription: Pio regis glorios. mem. Gustavi zelo a superstitionibus papisticis an. 1527 repurgata. See the Swedish Lutheran Mass (liturgy) from the *Kyrie* to the Benedicamus Domino, in *Kist*, Dänisches und Schwedisches, Mentz, 1869, p. 465.

Hosted by Google

In Sweden, as in every other country, the corruption of faith was coincident with the corruption of morals. Gustavus, interpreting a frightful storm that swept over the country as a divine visitation, and regarding himself as *the Supreme Head of the Church*, commanded the observance of an eight days' fast (June 8, 1554). A similar fast was ordered by the Archbishop of Upsala in 1558, "because," said he, "a great many persons, under plea of exercising an evangelical liberty, commit sin as a matter of course, thinking seemingly such evil living to be the end of the Gospel we preach."

Gustavus died September 10, 1560, and when his eldest son, *Eric XIV.*, ascended the throne, the condition of the Catholic Church was unchanged. Almost immediately after the accession of Eric a violent conflict broke out between the Calvinists on the one side and the Lutherans on the other. The former were led by one *Denis Beurreus*, a Frenchman, who was an intimate friend of both Calvin and Beza, and had, by his address, obtained an ascendancy over the young king's mind; and the latter by *John Oseg*, Bishop of Westeraes. The plans of the Calvinists miscarried, and their defeat was followed on September 14, 1568, by the dethronement and imprisonment of Eric, who, after enduring for eight years every sort of indignity, was finally forced to put an end to his life by taking poison (February 25, 1577).[1]

John III., the younger brother of Eric, and his successor to the throne (1568–1592), wearied and disgusted with the everlasting contentions of the Protestants, commenced to study the Fathers of the Church in the hope of finding the truth. He soon made up his mind to return to the Church, and his good resolution was strengthened and encouraged by his wife Catharine, a Polish princess, and Father *Herbst*, a Jesuit, and confessor to the queen. John at once set himself to the task of bringing about his own reconciliation with the Church and restoring the Catholic faith to his kingdom; and in this, as in everything else, he showed that unfaltering self-reliance and prudent foresight which are the natural adjuncts of a wise man working in a good cause. He began by pro-

[1] Chambers' Encyclopaed., art. "*Eric.*" (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

mulgating an instrument containing thirteen articles, intended to correct the morals of the clergy, which was closely followed by an order to the aged Archbishop Anderson to publish (1571) certain additions to the ritual, in which he said, among other things, "that the true faith had been announced by Ansgar and other Saints of Sweden, and that a knowledge of the writings of the Fathers was necessary to a right understanding of Holy Writ."[1] The Jesuit, Father Herbst, seized the present favorable opportunity to expose the so-called "*Agenda*," or line of conduct of the Swedish Church, and to make known the true Catholic doctrine, which had been shamefully misrepresented and mutilated by the Lutheran and other sectaries. His chief instrument in accomplishing both purposes was the "*Catechism of Peter Canisius*," which, being a standard exposition of Catholic teaching, he was desirous of having in the hands of every one. King John, though persuaded of the necessity of making the Catholic faith once more the religion of the land, thought it expedient and even necessary that the queen should receive the Blessed Sacrament under both kinds; but *Cardinal Hosius* opposed an unconquerable resistance to any such compromise.[2] Upon the death of the Archbishop of Upsala, the oldest and most formidable advocate of Lutheranism, and of the Bishops of Linkoeping and Westeraes, the king determined to fill these Sees with persons who would accept and carry out his policy. He was encouraged to take more decided measures by *Father Warszewicki*,[3] a clever Jesuit, by whose advice he convoked a Council (1574), which he opened with an address, deploring the sad condition to which dissensions and divisions had brought the Protestant Church. Finding the clergy not averse to his policy, he appointed *Lawrence Peterson Gothus* to the archiepiscopal see of Upsala, and *Martin* and *Erasmus* to those of Linkoeping and Westeraes respectively. Peterson having pledged himself to put his signature to seventeen articles, wholly Catholic in their nature and tenor, was con-

[1] *Theiner*, Pt. I., pp. 348–353.
[2] Ibid., Pt. I., pp. 363 sq.
[3] Ibid., Pt. I., p. 390 sq.

Hosted by Google

secrated according to the Roman rite, at the same time promising the king to employ his offices in gaining the other bishops over by degrees. Shortly afterward (1576) the king published a *Liturgy*, whose author was probably *Peter Fecht*,[1] his chancellor, and which obtained almost universal acceptance. It was, however, opposed by *Charles, Duke of Södermanland* (who, like his father, hoped to derive some advantage from the profession of Protestantism), on the ground "that he could not permit any change in the religion that had come to him as a heritage from his ancestors; that it was not in his power to put any constraint upon the consciences of his priests, or to force them to give up the teaching of the Gospel, which had been believed and practiced in their country for half a century, and had been confirmed with the seal and signature of so many persons."

About this time *Lawrence Nicolai*, a Jesuit, came from Belgium to Sweden, and was appointed by the king to a professorship of theology at Stockholm. In January, 1577, a discussion on the power and authority of the Church and on the Sacrifice of the Mass took place between *Nicolai* and the professors *Peter Jone* and *Olof Luth*, in which the Jesuit gained a splendid triumph. In consequence, the *Liturgy* was accepted by a Diet and National Council held shortly after, the discussion being the occasion for convoking the latter assembly. Encouraged by these auspicious beginnings, the king deputed Fecht, his chancellor, and the distinguished *Pontus de la Gardie*, who, besides being skilled in statecraft, was an accomplished man of the world, to represent him at the Papal Court. They were instructed to confer with Gregory XIII., the then reigning Pontiff, on the reunion of Sweden with the Catholic Church. Certain conditions, however, were stipulated, the chief of which were that laymen should be allowed to receive Communion under both kinds; that the national language should be used in divine worship; and that priests should be permitted to marry. Fecht was drowned at sea during the voyage. Gregory XIII. sent as

[1] Apud *Münter* (Magazine of the Ch. H. and C. L. of the North, Vol. II., p. 41–48), falsely attributed to the Jesuits. See *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 421 sq.

Hosted by Google

his Legate to Sweden *Anthony Possevin*,[1] a learned Jesuit, who, after many earnest conferences with King John, finally received his abjuration in 1578. In taking leave of the Papal Legate, the king, deeply moved, said: "In embracing thee, I express my eternal attachment to the Church of Rome." The Congregation, which assembled at Rome to consider the *twelve* concessions demanded by the king, refused to accede to several of them, and, in consequence, an animated controversy, set on foot and kept alive by the German divines, broke out in Sweden concerning the acceptance or rejection of the new Liturgy. The representatives and advocates of the conflicting opinions were called respectively *Philoliturgists* and *Misoliturgists*.

Duke Charles, while in Germany, conferred with the Protestant princes, and requested them to combine with him against his brother John. His young wife, too, being by birth a German, and a Lutheran in religion, very naturally became the patron and protector of the Protestant leaders once she had made Sweden her home. The king, moreover, had the misfortune to be surrounded by a number of subtle and dangerous intriguers.

James Typotius and the wily diplomatist, Pontus de la Gardie, urged the king to insist on having Rome grant his demands. The instructions of the Holy See to *Possevin*, on his return to Sweden in 1579, are outspoken and to the point. "We have done," said the Holy Father, "whatever in us lay to bring back this country to the Catholic Church; but if it please God that the event should be otherwise, we shall stand justified before the Lord, and be obliged to live on as we have for these forty years, without being able to secure the object for which we have longed." John made still another effort to get the Holy See to acquiesce in his demands, but again meeting with fresh refusals, his zeal for the Catholic faith began to grow cold, in spite of all Possevin could do to keep it aglow.

With the death of Queen Catharine (September 16, 1583) vanished the last hopes of restoring the Catholic Church in

[1] Cf. *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 457.

Hosted by Google

Sweden. John was not long in forgetting his pious Catholic consort, and at the Diet of Westeraes publicly announced his marriage with the young *Guneila Bjelke*, who in the sequel became the most powerful protector of Protestantism in the kingdom. Her influence over the king, to which *Chytraeus*, the celebrated theologian of Rostock, in a large measure contributed, became very manifest shortly after their marriage. Still the king to the end insisted on the adoption of his Liturgy, and openly quarreled on the subject with his brother, the Duke Charles, who was aspiring to the supreme government of Sweden; but beyond this he did nothing to forward the interests of the Catholic Church. He died in 1592. *Sigismund III.*, his son and successor, being the last of the Jagellons, was chosen King of Poland on the death of Stephen Bathory. Having been brought up in the Catholic faith, under the tender care of a loving and solicitous mother, he remained steadfast during his life to the lessons he had learned in his youth. Accordingly, when required by the Senators of Sweden, after the death of his mother, to make profession of the Augsburg Confession, as a condition to his succeeding to the throne, he replied: "I do not value an earthly crown *so* highly as to give a heavenly one in exchange for it." He was soon the idol of every Polish heart. *Stanislaus Karnkowsky*, speaking of him in a letter to his father, wrote as follows: "Who does not recognize and admire a special providence in all the Lord has done through this young and extraordinary king?" In the interval between his falling heir to the throne of Sweden and his arrival in that country, the administration of the government was placed in the hands of his uncle, the Duke Charles, who, using the power and resources at his command to further his own personal interests and ambition, cunningly made his profession of Protestantism a means to enable him to secure the crown. Having convoked a National Council at Upsala (February 25, 1593), composed of the Clergy and Estates of the kingdom and the deputies of the provinces, the duke made them an address, in the course of which he said: "Among the Swedes councils shall no longer be held, as among the Papists, by greasy fellows with shaven crowns."

Hosted by Google

The courage of the bishops deserted them, and, fawning like vile slaves in the presence of a master, they were servile enough to proclaim publicly that they had made a blunder in accepting the Liturgy of King John.

The Council rejected what it was pleased to call the abuses of Catholicity, and declared its acceptance of the Augsburg Confession; prohibited such as refused to profess the Lutheran creed from preaching the Gospel or teaching in the schools; and closed with the following words of triumph: "Henceforth the Swedes shall be of one heart and have but one God;" to which Duke Charles imperiously added: "Sigismund shall never be king if he refuse to make these concessions." When Sigismund returned to ascend the throne left vacant by his father, he made no secret of his devotion to the Catholic Church, and the exasperated Lutheran clergy, who were plotting with Duke Charles for the king's overthrow, avenged themselves by alienating as far as possible the hearts of the people from him. The presence of the Papal Nuncio, *Malaspina*, who accompanied the king, was the occasion and pretext of the most furious attacks upon the person of the latter. Acting upon the impulse of fanatical zeal and brutal insolence, they shortly went the length of telling the king he must not exercise any *public* act of Catholic worship. A Catholic Pole died at Stockholm, and his mortal remains were buried according to the rites of the Catholic Church; upon which *Eric Schepper*, a Lutheran preacher of that city, ascending his pulpit, preached a vehement tirade upon the enormity and turpitude of the act; and, to properly punish the inhabitants for their apathy and remissness in the presence of so flagrant an outrage, put them all under the ban of interdict. So perfidious were the intrigues carried on by Duke Charles, and so numerous and dangerous the plots entered into by him against Sigismund, that the latter had neither the time nor the opportunity to secure to himself that measure of authority to which his *fairness*, his honesty of purpose, and his principles of political and religious tolerance justly entitled him. Nevertheless, before leaving Sweden, he published a number of ordinances designed to promote the peace and prosperity of both Church and State. He in-

Hosted by Google

trusted the government of the country during his absence to Duke Charles and the royal judges. All the privileges and liberties claimed for the established Church of the country were solemnly confirmed; the revenues of both the higher and the inferior clergy were increased; and, finally, the hands of *bishops*[1] and prelates were strengthened in the exercise of their authority (March 16, 1594).

Sigismund was hardly well out of the country when the Lutheran preachers, led on by *Eric Schepper*, again began a violent attack upon him. He was reproached with having performed an idolatrous and papistical deed, because he had on Maundy-Thursday washed the feet of the poor, and the latter, being participants of the crime, were excommunicated and debarred from receiving alms for the future. Duke Charles was, if anything, more indecent than even the preachers in his assaults upon his kinsman and king, whom he held up as a traitor to his country and to the established religion of the land. The Diet of *Süderkoeping* (1595) declared him guilty of high misdemeanors, in that he had bestowed public offices on Catholics, and permitted them the free exercise of their religion; and it was accordingly enacted by this body that any one refusing within the term of the six weeks next ensuing to make profession of Lutheranism should quit the country, or, failing to do so, should be forcibly expelled by the authorities. It was further provided that no appeals should be made to the king during his absence from the country, and that not he, but Duke Charles, should appoint all public functionaries. A decree was also passed ordering the suppression of the noble *convent of Wadstena*. The plunder of the Church was divided pretty fairly between the duke and the Lutheran clergy, the former appropriating all

[1] In Sweden, as in Denmark, the office and dignity of *bishops* are merely *nominal*, the so-called Superintendents, though not in Orders, being in every sense their equals. Hence *Münter* (l. c., Vol. I., p. 334) makes the following observation: "The Church of Sweden is wholly in accord with that of Denmark as regards episcopal consecration, which it retains only as a venerable practice of the primitive Church, and in refusing to attach to the episcopal office any of those privileges and prerogatives which the advocates of the episcopal system have been in the habit of considering *as inherent in and flowing from the fact of consecration*."

Hosted by Google

the estates and the latter the sacred vessels and precious ornaments. Nothing was left undone to insure the triumph of Lutheranism. Did the people protest and make show of resistance? Every such indiscretion was followed by a more furious exhibition of the duke's cruelty.

Sigismund was not without hope that his return to the country (1598) might have the effect of restoring order. He might, had he pleased, have crushed his uncle by having recourse to arms, and thereby establish again his shattered authority; but his aversion to shedding Swedish blood deterred him from taking this extreme measure. Charles, destitute of magnanimity himself, and incapable of appreciating it in others, and ascribing the hasty departure of Sigismund to indecision and weakness of character, called an assembly of the States at *Jonkoeping* (January, 1599), before which he appeared, and accused the king of wishing to again plunge Sweden into the errors of Antichrist. Another assembly, which met at *Stockholm* in May of the same year, passed a resolution releasing the States from their oath of allegiance, should the king refuse to grant all their demands, and in particular the one requiring him to place his son Ladislaus in the custody of Duke Charles to be educated; for, it was said, should he continue a Catholic, he would forfeit all hope of the crown of Sweden. Any one who was either rash or bold enough to express his preference for Sigismund was effectually prevented from repeating the offense by having his head chopped off.[1] Charles forced the States at the Diet of *Linkoeping*, in 1600, to pass a law setting forth that Sigismund and his heirs had forfeited the crown of Sweden, because of his opposition to the true teaching of the Gospel. Many of the subjects of Sigismund, who had long lain in prison in expiation of their fidelity to their prince, and among whom were nine counsellors of State, were given their choice between death and allegiance to an usurper, and they unani-

[1] The periodical "*Sion*" for September, 1841, contains a remarkable letter, written from the North, in which the writer speaks of a curious book, entitled "*The Beheading Block of Duke Charles.*" About one hundred and forty persons were executed by his orders for offenses against the State, or, more definitely, for their allegiance to their lawful king.

Hosted by Google

mously preferred the former alternative, and died like heroes. On the 22d of March, 1604, the States again assembled at *Nordkoeping*, and declaring that Sigismund had forfeited the crown, placed it upon the head of Duke Charles.

Concerning the use made of Protestantism by *Gustavus Vasa* and *Charles IX.*, for the purpose of reaching the throne of Sweden, history has long since given her verdict.

§ 328. *Protestantism in Denmark, Norway, and Iceland.*

In *Denmark*,[1] as in the other Northern kingdoms, the political power was divided between the bishops and the nobility. The Bishop of *Röskilde* alone held thirty-three fiefs. As a rule, the bishops were both ignorant and licentious. The king, being elected by the two Estates, each nearly if not quite independent of the crown, and with conflicting interests, had not unfrequently conditions imposed upon him, which, besides being degrading to him as a monarch, could only with difficulty, if at all, be discharged. *Christiern II.* (1513–1523) could ill brook this ascendency, and resolved to humble the aristocratic classes and subvert their power. He took it for granted that Protestantism would be favorable to his designs, because, according to the teachings of Luther, princes might rob bishops of their estates, and strip them of all political influence, and not have their consciences in the least disturbed by a sense of moral obliquity. This prince, who was himself an impure despot and the submissive slave of his paramour's mother, had no purpose in introducing the principles of the Reformation into his kingdom other than to get possession of the wealth of the Church. Believing for the time that the terrible massacre, perpetrated by his orders in Stockholm, had been decisive in carrying out his plans in Sweden, he at once began his assault upon the Church in Denmark by handing

[1] Abridgment of the Hist. of the Reformation in Denmark, by *Ericus Pantoppidanus*, Lübeck, 1734. By the *same*, Annales (see Vol. II., p. 229, n. 2). *Münter*, Danske Reform Historie. Kjöbenh., 2 vols., and Ch. H. of Denmark and Norway, Lps. 1834, Vol. III. Cf. *Holberg*, Political History of Denmark and Norway, Copenh., 1731, 4to. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of Denmark and Hamburg, 1841, 3 vols.

Hosted by Google

over the Church of Copenhagen (1520) to a certain *Martin*, a disciple of Luther's, against the united protests of the Estates, the clergy, and the people. But Christiern would suffer no difficulties to stand in his way, and, where other means would not do, menace and the extreme of punishment were employed. Ecclesiastics, who pleased to remain unmarried, besides other disabilities, were forbidden to hold any real estate in their own name, and the Archbishop-elect of Lund was put to death. The despotism was too odious to be borne, and both bishops and barons united in a successful effort to overthrow it. Christiern was succeeded by *Frederic I.*, Duke of Slesvig and Holstein (1523–1533), who, in spite of the fact that he had bound himself by oath at his coronation to maintain the Catholic Church, soon began, from motives similar to those acted upon by his predecessor, to favor Protestantism in secret, and, after a time, openly professed himself a Protestant, and took the Lutheran preacher, *Hans Tausan* (after 1521), under his protection. He defended his line of conduct at the *Diet of Odensee*, in 1527, by saying that he had pledged himself to maintain the Catholic Church, but had not promised to tolerate her abuses. At this Diet he had a measure passed by which the same civil rights were secured to Lutherans as those enjoyed by Catholics, until such time as an Ecumenical Council could convene; but in the interval he was careful to break off all relations with Rome, and to reserve to himself the confirmation of persons appointed to bishoprics. The king summoned a conference on religion at Copenhagen in 1529, but the Catholic bishops, who had been placed in their sees by his favor, being both ignorant and worldly, were, single-handed, no match for their Lutheran adversaries, and they were therefore forced to call to their aid the distinguished Catholic German theologians, *Eck* and *Cochlaeus*. These theologians, however, failed to come, and the burden of the defense of the Catholic cause devolved upon *Stagefyr* of Cologne, the only Catholic theologian present. But new difficulties now arose to prevent a discussion. It was necessary, if it was to go on at all, that the disputants should speak Latin, which the Protestant champions peremptorily refused to do. The Catholics, moreover, claimed that the

Hosted by Google

authority of the writings of the Fathers and of the canons and decrees of Councils should be recognized, while the Protestants would admit no authority other than the Bible. Both parties were therefore under the necessity of putting their claims and grievances in writing, and of presenting them in this form to the king and counsellors of State, who, as might have been anticipated, declared Lutheranism the true and divinely revealed religion of Christ. Open acts of hostility against the Catholics were at once set on foot, in which the city of Malmö took the initiative. *Rönnow*, the Bishop of Röskilde, was forced to pay the king six thousand florins as a gratuity for his pallium.

Upon the death of Frederic, the bishops formally protested against the succession of his eldest son, *Christiern III.*, who was known to be a personal friend of Luther's; but this prince, fully confident that any aggressive act against the Church would conciliate the good-will of the lay nobility, issued an order for the arrest and imprisonment of all the bishops of Denmark (August 20, 1536), and demanded a surrender of their sees as the price of their freedom. Rönnow, Bishop of Röskilde, steadfastly refused to become a partner to so iniquitous a bargain, and died in prison in 1544, a martyr to his duty and his faith. In 1537, *Bugenhagen* was invited by the king from Wittenberg to complete the work of reformation in Denmark. Having crowned the king, he drew up a form of ecclesiastical organization, according to which every detail of Church government was wholly dependent upon the royal will. In the room of the bishops seven superintendents were appointed, who, after a time, resumed the now meaningless title of "*bishop*." The Diet of *Odensee* (1539) gave its approbation to this ecclesiastical organization, and the Diet of *Copenhagen* (1544) stripped the Catholic Church of all her rights and privileges, and parcelled out her possessions between the king and the nobles. Catholics were disabled from holding office and deprived of their hereditary rights; the Catholic clergy were commanded, under penalty of death, to quit the kingdom, and the same punishment was to be inflicted upon those who might harbor them.

Hosted by Google

Catholics wishing to remain in the country had to make their choice between exile or apostasy.

The Archbishop of Drontheim was largely instrumental in propagating Lutheranism in *Norway.*[1]. A faithful adherent of King Christiern II., he was obliged to seek safety in flight upon the fall of that prince, and, quitting his own country, found an asylum in the Netherlands (1537). After the forcible resignation of a second bishop and the imprisonment of a third, Protestantism was triumphant in the land, and one had either to profess it or be deprived of all rights, religious, political, and social. Numbers of the monks remained steadfast and went into exile rather than do violence to their consciences. In *Iceland*[2] the first attempts to introduce Lutheranism were firmly resisted by the inhabitants; but, being discouraged by the execution of *John Aresen*, a bishop, they held out for some time longer, and then gradually yielding (after 1551), began little by little to accept the new doctrines, and in the end were quite ready to receive any error that came in their way.

§ 329. *Protestantism in England.*

† Vera et sincera historia schismatis Anglicani a *Nic. Sandero*, aucta per *Ed. Richtonum*, tandem aucta et castigata per *Ribadeneiram*, Colon. 1628. **Laemmer*, Monumenta Vaticana, p. 25 sq., et passim. *Hundeshagen*, Epp. aliquot ineditae Buceri, Calvini, etc., ad hist. eccl. Britan., Bern. 1844. *Burnet*, Hist. of the Ref. of the Church of Engl., Lond. 1679 sq., 2 T. fol.; Oxf., 1816; Lond., 1825, 6 T.; Abridged ed., Brunswick, 1765, 2 vols. † *Dodd's* Church History of England, from the commencement of the sixteenth century to the revolution in 1688, with additions and a continuation by the Rev. *Tierny*, Lond. 1840, 4 vols. *Hume*, Hist. of Great Britain—of Engl., Lond. 1754 sq., 4 vols., and frequently. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of the English Revolution, Lps. 1848. *Gumpach*, Explanations and amendments of Dahlmann's Hist., Darmstadt, 1845. By the *same*, Separation of the English Church from Rome, Darmstadt, 1845. *Ranke*, English History, especially of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Berlin, 1859 sq., 6 vols. (Complete Works, Vols. XIV.–XXI.) *Maurenbrecher*, England during the Age of Reformation, Düsseldorf, 1866. †**John Lingard*, History of England, Vols. VI.–XII. Lord *John Russell*, Essay on the English

[1] *Gebhardi*, Hist. of Denmark (33d part of his Universal History, Halle, 1770, p. 156).

[2] *Harboe*, The Reformation in Iceland (Hist. Mem. of the Scientific Society of Copenhagen, Vols. VI. and VII., Altona, 1796).

Hosted by Google

Government and Constitution, 1823; new ed., 1865 (Germ. tr. accord. to the 4th ed., Freiburg, 1873). † *Audin*, Histoire de Henri VIII. et du schisme d'Angleterre, Par. 1850, 2 vols. † *Thommes*, Hist. of England during the Age of the Tudors, Mentz, 1866. *Cobbett*, Hist. of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland, 1824 (Germ., Offenbach, 1828, 3d ed.) † *Challoner*, Memoirs of the Missionary Priests and other Catholics who suffered death on account of religion in England between A. D. 1577–1684, Derby, 1844, 2 vols., 16mo.; the *same*, Philad 1840, 1 vol. (Germ. ed., 2 vols., Paderborn, 1852). *Boost*, Hist. of the Reformation and Revolution in England, Augs. 1843. Also an able series of articles by *T. W. M. Marshall, LL.D.*, in the *Tablet*, London newspaper of 1876. (TR.)

In the course of the religious and political movements which disturbed Europe, questions touching all the relations and phases of society and the family came up for discussion; and the question of marriage,[1] being necessarily among the rest, became the occasion and cause of the religious and political revolution that took place in England.

Henry VIII. succeeded to the throne of England upon the death of his father in 1509, when not quite eighteen years of age, and two months later (June 3) married *Catharine of Aragon*, the widow of his elder brother, *Arthur*, lately deceased. To marry his brother's widow a papal dispensation was necessary, which was granted by Pope Julius II. on Catharine's representation, the truth of which Henry himself afterward admitted, that her marriage with Arthur had not been consummated.

For seventeen years Henry lived a life of uninterrupted happiness with his queen, who during that time bore him five children, three sons and two daughters, of whom *Mary*, who subsequently ascended the throne, alone survived.

Henry was suddenly stricken with scruples of conscience as to the legality of his marriage, and these were probably quickened and intensified by the fading beauty of Catharine, who was six years his senior, and by the fascinating charms of *Anne Boleyn*, maid of honor to the queen, who had won his heart. Henry requested Pope Clement VII. to declare his marriage with Catharine invalid (1527). The Pope issued a commission to Cardinal *Campeggio*, the Papal Legate, and to Cardinal *Wolsey*, Henry's minister, to make the facts upon

[1] See p. 69, § 312.

Hosted by Google

which the application was based the subject of a judicial examination. The queen, deeming it unbecoming her dignity to have her marriage passed upon by a commission, which was not only composed of the king's subjects,[1] but which, she believed, did not enjoy the freedom necessary to judicial fairness, appeared before the court at Blackfriars only to offer an appeal to the Pope. Clement, unwilling to grant the king's demand, and yet desirous to avoid giving him offense, resorted to various expedients in order to gain time, in the hope that Henry would in the meanwhile return to a better mind. The effect was just the contrary, and every hindrance and delay added to the king's impatience. By the advice of *Cranmer*, the question was submitted to the universities of Europe. Those of Oxford and Cambridge declared in favor of the divorce; those of Germany decided against it; and those of France and Italy would not admit of its possibility, unless on the supposition that the queen's former marriage with Arthur had not been consummated.[2] But the end was not yet. The Pope's decision was not forthcoming. Henry was irritated, and in his anger had the payment of the *first-fruits to the Pope abolished.* This measure, which was intended as a menace to Rome, was followed by another, providing that, should the Pope refuse to confirm appointments to episcopal sees made by the crown, the appointees should dispense with such confirmation, and go on and be consecrated.

Henry had been privately married to Anne Boleyn in January, 1533, and it was therefore of the first importance to him that the affair of his divorce should be brought to a speedy issue. Cranmer had been working long and industriously to bring about a complete rupture with Rome, and

[1] Cardinal Campeggio was the incumbent of the See of Salisbury. (TR.)

[2] "In France the profuse bribery of the English agents would have failed with the University of Paris but for the interference of Francis himself. As shameless an exercise of Henry's own authority was required to wring an approval of his cause from Oxford and Cambridge. In Germany the very Protestants, in the fervor of their moral revival, were dead against the king. So far as could be seen from Cranmer's test [an appeal to the universities. (TR.)], every learned man in Christendom condemned Henry's cause."

Greene, Hist. of the English People. New York, 1876, p. 343. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

now that the crisis was come he was found fully prepared to meet it. The clergy were to be won over by threats and punishments. They were declared to have incurred the penalties of *Praemunire* for having unlawfully submitted to the legatine power of Cardinal Wolsey; but at the same time a hint was thrown out that they might expect a plenary pardon if they would consent to recognize the *king as the Supreme Head of the Church in England.* The clergy returned an equivocal answer, saying they were willing to accept his jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs, "in so far as they might consistently with the law of Christ," and with this qualified submission the king expressed himself satisfied. But to carry out his ulterior designs he had need of agents more devoted to his interests, and less conscientious as to their own duties. Such was Cranmer. As Henry's envoy on the Continent, he became familiar with the teachings of the Reformers, and, although in Holy Orders, privately married a niece of the famous German divine, Osiander. After Wolsey's disgrace, and on the death of Warham, Cranmer was appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury, and made privy counsellor to the king. One more ready to carry out the royal will and less scrupulous about the means to be employed in doing so could not have been chosen. Previously to taking the oath of fidelity to the Pope, on the day set apart for the ceremony, he withdrew to the chapter-house of St. Stephen's, at Westminster, and there, in the presence of witnesses, protested that in what he was about to do he had no intention of binding himself or laying himself under any sort of obligation to place the least obstacle in the way of the ecclesiastical reforms meditated by the king. This was the first of the series of hypocritical acts that followed.

Fully informed of Henry's marriage to Anne, Cranmer addressed him a letter in April, 1533, begging to know if it were the royal pleasure that the cause of divorce should be heard in his own ecclesiastical court, and, if so, requesting his majesty to submit in advance to the future decision. The king graciously complied with the suggestion of the archbishop, taking occasion, however, to remind his Lord of Canterbury that "the sovereign had no superior on earth, and

Hosted by Google

was not subject to the laws of any earthly creature." The Ecclesiastical Court was opened at Dunstable, and Catharine received three citations to appear before it. Having refused, she was pronounced "verily and manifestly contumacious," and her marriage was declared null and invalid. Cranmer conveyed the result to the king in a letter, in which he gravely exhorts his majesty to submit respectfully to the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Court, and to hasten to escape the censures of the Church, which he would bring upon himself by refusing to break off his incestuous intercourse with the wife of his brother. At another court, held May 28 at Lambeth, Cranmer, "in virtue of his spiritual power and his apostolic jurisdiction," pronounced the marriage of Henry and Anne valid and lawful. The Pope, acting on the almost unanimous opinion of the Sacred College, reversed the decision of Dunstable, and rendered a definitive sentence, declaring the marriage between Henry and Catharine lawful and valid. This decision was the signal for *the rupture with the Holy See*, and it was forthwith proclaimed that the Pope had no longer any jurisdiction in England. It was now the Archbishop of Canterbury who confirmed appointments to bishoprics and granted dispensations; but an appeal might be carried from the archbishop's tribunal to the royal chancery. The king was the Supreme Head of the Church of England and the source of all spiritual jurisdiction, whether episcopal or papal. The oath of supremacy was imposed upon all, and those refusing to take it were adjudged guilty of high treason. An order was issued enjoining that the Royal Supremacy should be proclaimed from every pulpit, and form part of the teaching of every school in the kingdom. The Pope's name was no longer heard in the land. *Thomas Cranmer*, a layman, was named vicar-general in all matters ecclesiastical, and received from the king plenary spiritual powers. All the bishops were simultaneously suspended from exercising their functions, and had their jurisdiction and power restored only after they had recognized the Royal Supremacy. In the eighth month after the nuptial ceremony, Anne Boleyn bore to Henry a daughter, who subsequently ascended the throne under the name of Elizabeth. Fearing that the shortness of the interval

Hosted by Google

between the marriage and the birth of the princess might give rise to suspicions touching her legitimacy and endangering her succession, Henry had an act passed requiring all his subjects to make oath that Elizabeth was the true and lawful heir to the throne.

The *confiscation of ecclesiastical property* next occupied the attention of king and parliament. A commission was appointed by Cromwell to make a general visitation of the religious houses of the kingdom (1535), with a view, as Mr. Hume candidly admits, of discovering such irregularities as might furnish a pretext for their suppression. Parliament, acting upon the report of these commissioners, familiarly called the "*Black Book*," hurriedly passed a bill providing for the suppression of all religious houses whose income was less than two hundred pounds a year, of which there were one hundred and seventy-six, and granting their revenues to the crown. It was said these were dissolved "*for the glory of Almighty God and the honor of the kingdom*," and because "they happened to be at once the weakest and the worst." (27 Henry VIII., c. 28.)

But the larger monasteries, "in which discipline was better observed," were destined to share the fate of the less considerable and more disorderly.

In the year 1536 there was an uprising of the inhabitants of the northern counties of England to protest against the recent innovations, and particularly against the expulsion of the monks from their monasteries. The insurgents bound themselves by oath to stand by each other "for the love which they bore to Almighty God, His faith, and the Holy Church;" and everywhere along the route of their march, which was called "The Pilgrimage of Grace," they seized the suppressed monasteries, and restored them to the ejected monks. The communities of the larger monastic establishments were now charged with having taken part in this insurrection, and, as a punishment for their complicity, their houses were dissolved and their property confiscated. In the southern counties fair promises and large bribes were held out to the abbots and more considerable personages of the various houses; and when these failed of their purpose, frauds, threats, and vio-

Hosted by Google

lence were resorted to. The work of suppressing the monasteries was completed by an act of parliament in 1539, "vesting in the crown all property, movable and immovable, of the monastic establishments, which either had already been or should hereafter be suppressed, abolished, or surrendered."[1] By the year 1540 the work of "secularization" had been completed; the royal will had been carried out with shocking vandalism; works that had cost years of patient and skillful labor, the triumphs of art and the monuments of science, all were destroyed. Nor did the hatred of the ancient faith stop here. The tombs of *St. Augustine*, the apostle of the Anglo-Saxons, and *St. Thomas à Becket*, martyr to his defense of ecclesiastical immunities, were despoiled, and the ashes they contained flung to the winds. Even the tomb of *King Alfred*, the Founder of England's greatness, did not escape the hands of the ravager. From the revenues of the confiscated monastic establishments Henry founded and scantily endowed six bishopries and fourteen cathedral and collegiate churches; but the bulk of the sacrilegious plunder went to indemnify the royal visitors and the parasites of the court. But, notwithstanding these tyrannical proceedings, Henry had not yet fully made up his mind to *wholly separate* himself from the Catholic Church. "I will strike off," he said, "her *strange* Head with the tiara, but the body I will leave untouched."

In the year 1538, Henry, by a statute, entitled "An Act for Abolishing Diversity of Opinions," ordained that certain doctrines and practices, which were substantially those of the Roman Catholic Church, should be accepted and professed by all his subjects, under the severest penalties. Even the use of holy water and blessed ashes was retained, and the veneration of the saints enjoined. This statute contained what are known as the "*Bloody Six Articles*," in which the doctrines were enumerated, concerning which there was the greatest conflict of opinions. They declared transubstantiation to be necessary to salvation, and clerical celibacy to be of Divine command; that private Masses should be retained, and that auricular confession was expedient and necessary. It was

[1] *Lingard*, Hist. of Engl., London, 1847, Vol. VI.

Hosted by Google

further ordained that the severest penalties should be inflicted upon any one refusing to accept these teachings.[1] Henry permitted the reading of the Bible to all, reminding them, however, that this was not their right, but a favor granted "of the royal liberality and goodness," and that when they should meet passages difficult of interpretation, they should apply to others more learned than themselves.[2] But whatever leniency he might show in other matters, there was one to which no opposition would be tolerated. His spiritual supremacy was sacred, and must be so regarded by all his subjects. For writing against it, *Forest*, confessor to Queen Catharine, was burnt at the stake; and others, who called it in question, were put to death in various ways. Among the victims of Henry's despotism and cruelty, *Thomas More*, High Chancellor, and *John Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester,[3] were the most illustrious for their position, their learning, their virtues, and the fortitude with which they suffered. Of the latter Henry said on one occasion: "In my opinion, I have never met, in all my travels, any one to compare in learning and virtue with the Bishop of Rochester." Bishop Fisher refused to acknowledge the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn as "good and lawful," and for this offense he was soon to feel the full weight of the royal vengeance. He was shortly arrested for misprision of treason, in that he had heard a woman named Elizabeth Barton, better known as the Holy Maid of Kent, say that the king would survive his divorce from Catharine only seven months, and had failed to report the conversation. An oath was presented to him, affirming the legality of the king's marriage with Anne, which he declined to take, and was in consequence committed to the Tower April 26, 1534. He was now close on seventy years of age, but neither his gray hairs nor his past services could move the heart of the royal despot to mercy. He languished in prison for thirteen months, enduring privations the most severe and cruelties the most barbarous; and when he again came forth it was only to appear before a special commission appointed to try

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. VI., p. 293. (Tr.)

[2] Ibid., p. 278. (Tr.)

[3] †*Kerker*, John Fisher, Bp. of Rochester and Martyr, Tübg. 1860.

Hosted by Google

him at Westminster, on the charge of high treason, for having refused to make oath that the king was the "Supreme Head of the Church of England." After a hasty trial, he was declared guilty, and beheaded June 22, 1535. In the preceding May he had been created cardinal by Pope Paul III., but, though he may have appreciated the kindness, he had now ceased to put any value on dignities, and declared that, "if the hat were at his feet, he would not stoop to take it up." His head was set up on London-bridge, and his body, after lying naked all day at the place of execution, was carried away by the guards, and laid in the church-yard of All Hallows, Barking.[1]

Thomas More, by his great learning and extraordinary capacity for business, had risen from a comparatively low station to the office of Lord Chancellor of England. Distinguished for his literary ability, his knowledge of law, his winsome manners, and sweetness of temper, he was no less conspicuous for his deep and unaffected piety and his unwavering fidelity to his friends; thus uniting in himself the qualities of a statesman, a scholar, and a Christian. But neither his virtues, his abilities, nor his services could save him from the savage ferocity of Henry. More had refused to approve Henry's divorce from Queen Catharine and his marriage with Anne Boleyn, and for this offense he, like Bishop Fisher, was committed to the Tower, and, like him, too, brought forth again only to be arraigned before the commission at Westminster on the charge of high treason, for having denied the king to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England. As soon as the indictment had been read, More was told that he might still enjoy the king's favor by abjuring his former opinions. The offer was promptly declined, and the prisoner was declared guilty and condemned to death. He met death with the same vivacious cheerfulness and unfaltering courage that had distinguished him through life, professing with his last breath that he died a true Catholic before God. He was beheaded in the Tower July 6, 1535.[2]

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. VI., pp. 220–221. (Tr.)

[2] Thomae Mori opera, Lovanii, 1566. Thomas More, Represented according to Authentic Sources, by *Dr. Rudhart*, Nürnberg, 1829. Sir Thomas More:

Hosted by Google

Cardinal Reginald Pole was equally the object of Henry's[1] vindictive cruelty. Having completed his education abroad, he returned to England in 1525, where the highest ecclesiastical dignities were awaiting his acceptance. About this time the king was meditating his divorce from Catharine, which Pole not only opposed, but still further incensed Henry by the publication of his treatise, "*De Unitate Ecclesiastica.*" His pension and all his preferments were withdrawn, and preparations were being made for his impeachment, when he eluded the king's vengeance by escaping to the Continent. The Pope rewarded his courage and constancy by raising him to the cardinalate. He was sent as Legate to France and the Low Countries in 1537, when Henry in vain demanded his extradition from the governments of these countries.

Failing to avenge himself on Pole, the king had his mother, the aged Countess of Salisbury, and others of the obnoxious cardinal's relations arrested, tried upon fictitious charges, and put to death. The Countess of Salisbury was the nearest of kin to Henry of all his blood relations; was the last in the direct line of the Plantagenets, who had ruled England for so many generations; and both in prison and with her head upon the block showed a dignity and courage worthy her royal descent. She was beheaded May 21, 1541, repeating the words of our Lord, "Blessed are they who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake."

Thomas Cromwell, who had been chiefly instrumental in shedding so much blood, was himself to be judged by the bloody laws he had made, and in virtue of which so many noble victims fell. Henry had never quite forgiven him for his share in negotiating the marriage with that unlovely woman, Anne of Cleves, who contributed so much to disturb the king's domestic happiness. He was arrested on the 10th of June, 1540, and cast into prison. He was accused of malversation in the discharge of his office of chancellor; of hold-

His Life and Times, by *W. J. Walter*, London, 1840. *Thommes.* Thomas More, Augsburg, 1847.

[1] Cf. Vol. III. of New Series of Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, London, 1869. See *Reumont*, in the Bonn Theological Review, 1870, nros. 25 and 26.

Hosted by Google

ing heretical opinions and protecting heretics; and, finally, of treason, in that he had expressed his readiness to fight against the king, if it were necessary, in defense of his religious opinions. He demanded a public trial, and to be confronted with his accusers, but the justice which he had denied to so many others was now refused to himself. A bill of attainder was drawn up against him, and passed both houses of parliament without a dissentient voice. On the 28th of July following he was beheaded on Tower Hill. Stern and unrelenting during life, he was craven and cowardly at the hour of death.

Henry was as atrociously cruel to his wives as he was to his ministers and other subjects of inferior degree. Catharine of Aragon survived her repudiation a little less than three years, dying a most exemplary death January 8, 1536. She was hardly laid in her grave, when Anne Boleyn, who had taken her place in her husband's affections, and was the cause of all her misfortunes, was tried on the charges of adultery, incest, and high treason, declared guilty, and beheaded on the green within the Tower, May 19, 1536. Cranmer, who had formerly, "in virtue of his apostolic authority," pronounced the marriage between Henry and Anne lawful and valid, was now called upon to reverse his former decision, and, "*in the name of Christ and for the glory of God*," declared that the same marriage was and always had been null and void. On the day of Anne's execution, as if to express his contempt for her memory, Henry dressed himself in a suit of white, and on the following morning was married to *Jane Seymour*, who died (October 24, 1537) in less than a fortnight after giving birth to a male child, subsequently known as Edward VI. Henry was next married to *Anne of Cleves* in the beginning of the year 1540. The marriage was a political one, brought about through the agency of Thomas Cromwell, who hoped to strengthen the Protestant cause in England and prop up his own power through the influence of the new queen, who was known to be a thorough-going Lutheran. Deceived as to her beauty and personal attractions, Henry married her only because he could not well help himself, and, after living with her six months, procured a divorce mainly

Hosted by Google

on these grounds (July 13). Within a month (August 8) he married *Catharine Howard*, who, being shortly after charged with having committed adultery, was pronounced guilty, and beheaded February 13, 1541. Henry's sixth and last wife, *Catharine Parr*, was on one occasion nearly losing her head for venturing to differ on theological questions from the Head of the Church of England; but quickly detecting her mistake, she escaped the royal vengeance by adroitly flattering his great wisdom and theological learning, expressing her most humble submission to his judgment, and professing that in differing from him she had only desired to draw him into a heated discussion, because, when animated, he seemed to forget the pain of the malady from which he was suffering. By this clever expedient, Catharine kept her head on her shoulders, and had the good fortune to outlive the brutal monster, who died in 1547.

Henry reigned for thirty-eight years, and during that time he ordered the execution of two queens, two cardinals, two archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors and monks, thirty-eight doctors of divinity and laws, twelve dukes and earls, one hundred and sixty-four gentlemen, one hundred and twenty-four commoners, and one hundred and ten ladies.

Edward VI., who was only ten years of age at the death of his father, succeeded to the throne of England; but by an article in the last will and testament of Henry sixteen individuals were named to exercise the authority of the crown until the young prince should have completed his eighteenth year. This arrangement was broken through by Edward Seymour, the young king's uncle, then Earl of Hereford and afterward *Duke of Somerset*, who was ardently attached to the principles of the Reformation. He succeeded in having himself appointed Protector of the realm and guardian of the king's person. The king renewed the authority of Cranmer, and parliament withdrew from the chapters the right of electing bishops. All pretense of observing Catholic forms, so much insisted on during his lifetime by Henry, was now cast aside, and tokens of *apostasy* were everywhere visible. The Mass was abolished, the marriage of priests authorized, and

Hosted by Google

the use of the vulgar tongue in public worship introduced. Images, statues, sacred ornaments, altars, private chapels,—in short, whatever served to preserve or revive the remembrance of the ancient faith, was either destroyed or put out of sight. Refractory bishops were deposed, and their goods confiscated.

In the year 1547 a *Book of Homilies* was published, with the double purpose of supplying the want of sermons and securing uniformity of belief. This was followed in the succeeding year by a *Catechism*, the work of Cranmer, the object of which was set forth to be "for the singular profit and instruction of children and young people." Shortly after, Cranmer, "by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," and with the assistance of Ridley and eleven other divines, began the composition, or rather compilation, of a liturgy or service-book in the English tongue, and for the use of the English Church. Taking as their pattern and guide the Roman Catholic missal and breviary, and omitting whatever they conceived to be either superfluous or superstitious, they completed a work containing offices for the various Sundays and holydays, forms for the administration of the Sacraments, service for the dead, and whatever else was necessary to the public worship of the new Church. This is known as *The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* In January, 1549, the king drew the attention of both houses of parliament to it, by whom its use was made obligatory on all ministers of the Church within the realm of England after the ensuing Pentecost, and the use of any other was forbidden under severe penalties. The "*Church Established by Law*" was definitely fixed upon the English people by the aid of foreign and mercenary troops. The effects of suppressing the monastic establishments became now apparent. The poor, who had been in the habit of receiving abundant alms from the wealth of the Church, were now the objects of harsh legislation. Beggars were forbidden to solicit alms, and, if they persisted in doing so, they were cast into prison, and a mark of infamy set upon them by branding them on their foreheads and breasts with red-hot iron. The Duke of Somerset, fearing the ambitious designs of his younger brother, Sir Thomas

Hosted by Google

Seymour, and, it is said, at the instigation of Cranmer, had him arrested, tried on the charge of high treason for plotting to get possession of the young king's person and meditating a change of government, and executed March 20, 1549. In less than three years the Duke of Somerset himself fell a victim to the jealousy and vindictiveness of his rival, the Earl of Warwick, lately created Duke of Northumberland. He was accused of having meditated the assassination of Northumberland and two other noblemen, declared guilty of felony, and beheaded January 22, 1552. He was succeeded, after his first arrest, in the latter part of 1549, in the office of Protector by *John Dudley*, Earl of Warwick,[1] who, judging from his dying declaration, was certainly a Catholic, though he never took any measures to re-establish the ancient faith. It was now found that the Book of Common Prayer, which had been compiled by Cranmer and others, "under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," about three years before, contained some errors, which it was necessary to correct. It was accordingly revised and amended by Cranmer, assisted by *Bucer* and *Peter Martyr*, and, in its altered form, approved by Convocation and sanctioned by both houses of parliament (1552). The bishops were authorized by statute to punish with spiritual censures, and the magistrates with corporal penalties, all who should introduce or use a different Service. Any one attending a form of worship other than that prescribed in the Liturgy of the Church of England was condemned to imprisonment for a term of six months for the first offense, twelve months for the second, and during his natural life for the third. This is known as *The Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* It was also ascertained that the "*Six Bloody Articles*" of Henry VIII. were now by no means faithful expositions of the belief of the English Church, and Cranmer received orders to frame others which should adequately express it and be recognized by all as the standard of orthodoxy. After consultation with his friends, the archbishop drew up a formula of belief, known as "*The Forty-two Articles*," had it approved by a committee of bishops and divines, sanctioned by

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. VII. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

the king, and subscribed by all church-wardens, school-masters, and clergymen.[1] These *Articles*, however, were never ratified by parliament; nor is there any proof, except the printed title, that they ever received the sanction of Convocation.[2]

To perfect the organization of the Church of England, a body of ecclesiastical law was still necessary. This had been under consideration during the reign of Henry VIII., but was not carried into effect until the reign of Edward VI., when an act was passed empowering the king to give the force of law to any ecclesiastical regulations framed by a commission of thirty-two, taken in equal number from the spiritual and lay estates of the realm. To avoid inconvenience and unnecessary complication, the duty was delegated to a sub-committee of eight persons, with Cranmer at their head. This committee drew up a body of ecclesiastical law under the title of "*Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*," in fifty-one articles, which, though not published, in consequence of the premature death of the king (July 6, 1553), are interesting as giving the views of the English reformers on many questions of vital importance.[3]

Cranmer had decided, and parliament had confirmed the decision, that Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon and that with Anne Boleyn were both invalid; and, as a consequence, neither Mary, the issue of the former, nor Elizabeth,

[1] These Articles are given in *Burnet*, Vol. II., and in *Salig's* Hist. of the Augsburg Confession, Vol. II.

[2] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. VII., pp. 90–92. (TR.)

[3] The following points relating to marriage are interesting, and might be referred to as high authority for some of the decisions delivered in our own divorce courts: "The marriage of minors, without the consent of their parents or guardians, and of all persons whomsoever, without the previous publication of banns, or the entire performance of the ceremony in the Church according to the Book of Common Prayer, are pronounced of no effect. . . . Divorces are allowed, not only on account of adultery, but also of desertion, long absence, cruel treatment, and danger to health or life: in all which cases the innocent party is permitted to marry again, the guilty condemned to perpetual exile or imprisonment. To these five cases is added confirmed incompatibility of temper; but this, though it may justify a separation, does not allow either party the privilege of contracting another marriage." *Lingard's* History of England, London, 1848, Vol. VII., pp. 93–94. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

the issue of the latter, could succeed to the throne. Hence the Protector, who was conspiring to secure the succession to his own family, brought about a marriage between his son, Lord Guilford Dudley, and *Lady Jane Grey*, daughter of the Duchess of Suffolk and grand-daughter of Mary, the sister of Henry VIII.

The Duke of Northumberland, who exercised unlimited control over the mind of the dying king, Edward, represented to him the dangers which would follow to the Protestant faith should Mary succeed to the throne, and persuaded him to sign a document entailing the crown on Lady Jane Grey and her heirs male. To this measure the Lords of the Council reluctantly gave their assent. Edward expired at Greenwich July 6, 1553, and, four days later, Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed queen. The ambition of Northumberland was now apparent. A few days later, at the head of thirty thousand men, who had flocked to her standard from pure motives of loyalty, *Mary* entered London amid the joyful acclamations of the people (July 31), and was crowned by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, September 30th. The Protector was at once arrested, tried, found guilty of high treason, and decapitated, professing before his execution that he died in the faith of his fathers. In the beginning of the following year, Lady Jane Grey and her husband were also tried and executed; he on Tower-hill; she, because of her royal descent, on the green within the Tower.

Queen Mary earnestly desired to see the ancient faith again the religion of England, and to this end a bill was introduced into parliament toward the close of the year 1553, providing that all religious innovations should be abolished, and that ecclesiastical affairs should be restored to the condition in which they were in the first year of the reign of Henry VIII. Such a measure would have compelled the surrender of all church-property confiscated during the last two reigns, and now divided up among the wealthy families of the kingdom, who, having no intention to part with their spoil, opposed and caused the withdrawal of the bill. This was effected by the queen's proroguing parliament. In the next session, opened three days later, a modified bill was introduced, in

Hosted by Google

which all mention of the Pope's Supremacy and the alienation of church-property was carefully omitted, and the restoration of religion to its condition at the accession of Edward proposed. The bill passed both houses, thus leveling at a blow the great structure that had been built up with so much care and labor by Cranmer and his associates.

In the following year, Cardinal Pole came as Papal Legate to England, and, after thanking the Lords and Commons for having repealed his attainder, expressed the hope that they would likewise repeal all statutes hostile to the Pope's jurisdiction, and his willingness and ability to do whatever might be necessary to bring about a complete reconciliation between England and the Holy See. The motion for a union with Rome was carried in both houses almost by acclamation. The Pope's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs was recognized; the Sacrifice of the Mass was restored; clerical celibacy enjoined; and married priests deprived of their cures. The Protestant bishops, who professed to derive their authority and jurisdiction immediately from the crown, were now, consistently with their own principles, deposed, and Catholic prelates appointed in their room.

Cardinal Pole absolved "the whole nation and the dominions thereof . . . of all judgments and penalties" incurred on account of heresy and schism, after which a *Te Deum* was sung in thanksgiving for the happy issue of affairs. It was the intention of Cardinal Pole to effect the restoration of the ancient faith by *pacific* means, and to stem the tide of apostasy by the labors of a learned and pious clergy, the importance of whose instruction and training he was constantly and earnestly urging. Mary, unfortunately, did not share these wise and moderate views, obstinately insisting that heretics should be punished with death; and to this end, besides the laws already existing and in force in the two preceding reigns, making heresy a capital offense, revived others formerly enacted for the suppression of the Lollards. But, while it must be frankly admitted that the rigor exercised during this reign in punishing heretics was excessive, on the other hand it can not be said, in view of the atrocities perpetrated during preceding and subsequent reigns, that Mary

Hosted by Google

merits the distinctive appellation of "*Bloody.*" Neither were her acts of cruelty wholly without excuse.

The proclamation of Lady Jane Grey as queen was urged ostensibly on the specific ground that Mary was a Catholic; and her religious opponents uniformly supported, if they did not inspire, every tumult, sedition, and revolt excited against her. Moreover, of the two hundred and seventy-nine persons executed during her reign, many, like *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, were contemptible miscreants; while others, like *Latimer*, were perfidious knaves. Cranmer, who had been making decisions in the fullness of his authority during his whole life, and reversing them again at the bidding of an incontinent king; composing prayer-books "under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," and, at the suggestion of such reformers as Bucer and Peter Martyr, correcting the errors which the Holy Ghost had permitted him to insert; signing articles of faith under Henry VIII., and rejecting them again as false under Edward VI.; went on asserting and denying, as suited his interest or convenience, till the last hour of his life. In the hope of saving his life, he signed no fewer than six retractations, and on each occasion vehemently professed his attachment to the Catholic faith; but, finding that these availed not to secure his pardon, he recalled them all at the moment of execution, and faced death (March 21, 1556) with a courage that must be admired, if the cause in which he suffered can not be approved.

After the death of Mary, in 1558, everything conspired to forward the interests of Protestantism, and to identify them with those of *Elizabeth*.[1] For Elizabeth to remain a Catholic was all one with proclaiming her mother an adulteress, her own birth illegitimate, and, as a consequence, her eligibility to the throne impossible. If her claims were to be supported at all, they must be supported by the Protestants. Besides religious, there were also political considerations in her favor. By her exclusion, the English crown would have been the

[1] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. I. and III.; and *Hefele*, Isabella of Spain and Elizabeth of England, being a historical parallel (Cardinal Ximenes, p. 89–101).

Hosted by Google

right of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, and great-granddaughter of Henry VII. Mary had married the Dauphin of France with the express stipulation that, should she die without issue, her right, not only to the throne of Scotland, but also to that of England, should pass to the King of France, thus making England a dependency of the French crown. The very thought of England passing under the dominion of a foreign prince was revolting to English pride; and the feelings of indignation with which the country at large contemplated such a contingency were greatly intensified by the fact that the relations of the English government, at this time, with those of Scotland and France were the reverse of friendly. Animated by such feelings, and swayed by such motives, the English people permitted Elizabeth to ascend the throne without opposition. During the reign of Mary, Elizabeth had frequently made public profession of the Catholic faith, and expressed her sincere attachment to the Catholic Church. After her accession she had been crowned according to the Catholic ritual, by a Catholic bishop, and had sworn to maintain the Catholic religion; but, notwithstanding her professions, her conformity, and her solemn pledges, she was hardly seated upon the throne before she declared openly in favor of Protestantism.

By the advice of *Sir William Cecil*, the English embassador at the Court of Rome was recalled; the Protestants exiled during the preceding reign permitted to return and appear openly at court; and both houses of parliament filled with ardent partisans of the new faith. Parliament assembled in the early part of the year 1559; revived the statutes of Henry VIII. against Papal authority, and those of Edward VI. in favor of the Reformed service; bestowed the tithes and annats upon the queen, and once more invested royalty with ecclesiastical *Supremacy*. It was further enacted that all clergymen taking orders or holding livings; all magistrates and inferior functionaries receiving salaries or fees from the crown; and all laymen suing out the livery of their lands, or about to do homage to the queen, should take an oath declaring her supreme in ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs, under penalty of

Hosted by Google

deprivation and incapacity; and that any one asserting the Pope's authority within the realm should, for the second offense, forfeit his property, real and personal, and, if contumacious, be condemned to perpetual imprisonment and death, as in cases of high treason.[1]

Of all the prelates who had held office under Mary, one alone, the Bishop of Landaff, who consented to take the oath of Supremacy, was permitted to retain his see. The other sees were filled by men who had either gone into exile on the Continent, or were conspicuous at home for their attachment to the new faith. Among these the most distinguished was *Matthew Parker*, formerly chaplain to Anne Boleyn, whom Elizabeth now rewarded by appointing him to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He was consecrated by Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath, who had lately embraced the reformed teachings, and having been appointed to the See of Chichester, assisted Parker in consecrating the other newly-created bishops.[2]

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. VII., pp. 259–260. (TR.)

[2] Ibid., pp. 262–263. (TR.)

The question touching the validity of the consecration of these Anglican bishops, and, as a consequence, the validity of all Anglican ordinations, has been frequently discussed. It was at first objected that *Barlow*, the consecrator of Parker, had not himself been consecrated according to the ritual of the Roman Pontifical; but this objection, being regarded by some as not decisive, another, still stronger, drawn from the *formula of consecration*, contained in the Ordinal of Edward VI., the one used in the consecration of Parker, was more confidently urged. The formula ran as follows: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember to stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands." It will be seen that these words have no direct bearing on the purpose for which they were used; contain no reference to the *office and authority of a bishop;* and might therefore be used with equal propriety in the baptism or confirmation of children. They have no specific meaning limiting their application to the consecration of bishops. To remedy this defect, the formula was changed by convocation in the year 1662, under Charles II., and made to read as follows: "*Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by this imposition of our hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." Archbishop *Kenrick* (The Validity of Anglican Ordinations, Phil. 1848, p. 197) remarks "that such a change, made in such circumstances, is equivalent to a tacit avowal of the insufficiency the of from which

Hosted by Google

In the year 1560 the *Book of Common Prayer* was again revised, a few alterations introduced, and it was provided that, in the absence of clergymen, laymen, and even artisans, might recite the prayers.

In the fourth year of Elizabeth's reign (1563), Convocation, presided over by Archbishop Parker, again examined and revised the *Forty-two Articles* of Edward VI., which, it will be remembered, were mainly the production of *Cranmer*. The Articles being the standard and test of orthodoxy in the English Church, it was essential they should set forth the exact creed of that body. After mature consideration, some of the Articles of Edward VI. were dropped, and others substituted in their room; and some were mended by additions or changes of phraseology, the result being the instrument now known as the *Thirty-nine Articles*. By this instrument, in which some changes were again made in 1571, the spiritual supremacy of the Pope was denied; the Sacrifice of the Mass, which was termed "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit," was abolished; the Catholic doctrines of transubstantiation and purgatory rejected; and the according of reverence to relics and images, and the invocation of saints, reprobated. Of the seven Sacraments, *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, taken under both kinds, were alone retained; *Holy Scripture* was declared to contain everything necessary to salvation, and to be the sole rule of faith (Art. VI.); but it was added (Art. XXXIII.) that any one who, "through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break *the traditions and ceremonies of the Church*, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, ought to be rebuked openly, as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church." By Article XXXV., it was decreed that the Ordinal of Edward VI. "contained all things necessary *to the consecration of archbish-*

had been used during the first century of the Anglican Church." If, therefore, the form contained in the Ordinal of Edward VI., and used in the consecration of all bishops during the reign of Elizabeth, was not adequate to validly confer episcopal consecration, it follows that all subsequent ordinations were also necessarily invalid. But Elizabeth *supplied any defects* of the ritual. *Harduin, S. J.*, Dissertation du Père le Courayer sur la succession des évesques anglais et sur la validité de leur ordinations, Paris, 1714, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

ops and bishops and the ordering of priests and deacons;" and it was added, "whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, or hereafter shall be," are to be "reputed as rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered."[1]

It will be seen that in recognizing *a hierarchy of three orders of clergy as an essential element* in its constitution, the Anglican Church differed widely from every other sect of Protestantism. Finally, the Anglican Church retained, with some changes, the ancient *ecclesiastical ritual*, as given in the missals of the Roman Catholic Church; also the *sign of the Cross*, *sacred vestments*, and even attempted to arrogate to itself the name of *Catholic*.

It was not long before the *Established Church* encountered opposition from a certain class of its own members, known in history as *Nonconformists* or *Puritans*. Professing to be followers of the "*pure word of God*," in contradistinction to whatever was of human origin or tradition, they contended that the Anglican Church, by the use of its *Liturgy*, ceremonies, and discipline, too nearly resembled the Church of Rome, and that the line of distinction between the two should be more boldly drawn and more sharply defined.

All were willing to recognize the supremacy of the queen, if for no other reason, because they regarded such a recognition as a protest against the Pope. On this one point all were in perfect accord; but on others there was a wide divergence of opinion. Some were willing to accept the *Liturgy*, ceremonies, and discipline, provided these were revised and pruned of whatever savored too much of papistry; others, who regarded bishops as the servile agents of the crown, and hated them on account of their aristocratic tastes and tendencies, wished to abolish the Episcopacy altogether, and substitute *Presbyterianism;* and still others, who were equally hostile to

[1] *Hardwick*, Hist. of the Arts. of Religion, London, 1859, where the Articles of 1553-1563 and 1571 are given in Appendix III. (Tr.)

They are found in Latin in *Augusti*, Corp. libror. symbolicor, pp. 126–142 (Germ. in *Bonn Review*, new series, year V., n. 1, p. 196–208; *Freiburg Periodical*, Vol. XII., pp. 250–261.) Cf. the art. "*High-Church*," in the *Freiburg Cyclop.*, and in the Voices (*Stimmen*) of Maria Laach.

Hosted by Google

both the Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, assumed the attitude and professed the principles of thoroughgoing *Dissenters.*

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, after a series of misfortunes, abdicated the crown, under compulsion, in favor of her son. She was then a prisoner in the castle of *Lochleven*, but having made her escape, she revoked her act of abdication, and again assumed the style and authority of a sovereign. An army of loyal and trusty followers at once enrolled themselves under her standard, but they were no match either in numbers or discipline for the experienced soldiers of the regent, Murray, by whom they were defeated in the battle of Langside, May 13, 1568. After this disaster, Mary fled hastily across the border into England, and, against the advice and in spite of the remonstrances of her friends, sought the hospitality and protection of Elizabeth, by whom she was detained a prisoner during the remainder of her days. An attempt, made in November, 1569, by the Catholic gentlemen of the northern counties to liberate the royal captive, was promptly put down, and hundreds of the insurgents executed. The only effect of the uprising was to intensify the hatred of Elizabeth for her Catholic subjects. In the following year the queen was still further exasperated by the publication of the bull of Pius V., declaring her cut off from the communion of the Church, her crown forfeited, and absolving her subjects from their allegiance. The condition of the Catholics of England became now almost intolerable. To receive or obey a papal bull or brief of any character whatever, or to deny the spiritual supremacy of the queen, was declared high treason; to refuse to attend Protestant worship ("*recusancy*") was punished with fines, imprisonment, and bodily chastisements; and a body of inquisitors was appointed, who, penetrating into the privacy of families, made search for and seized any papers that might throw a shade of suspicion upon the loyalty or the orthodoxy of their possessors, and were on the alert to catch any unguarded word or expression that might be tortured into an evidence of guilt.

It was hoped that these measures would soon rid England of the presence of Catholic priests, and that in their absence

Hosted by Google

the Catholic religion would wholly perish from the land. This, however, was prevented by the foresight of *William Allen*, a Catholic priest, descended from an ancient Lancashire family, and formerly principal of St. Mary's Hall, at Oxford, who, in 1568, established a seminary at Douay, in Flanders, for the education of Catholic clergymen destined for the English mission. This seminary, which, in the course of five years, sent nearly one hundred priests across to England, was in 1578 transferred to Rheims, to be out of reach of the harassing persecutions of Elizabeth, but was again re-established at Douay in 1593.

The severest measures of the law were employed to free the country from the presence of such priests as were already there and to deter others from entering it. The penalty of death was pronounced against all priests coming into England, and a like penalty against those who should either afford priests an asylum or go to confession to them. To ordain a priest in England was also declared an offense, punishable with death, and all priests in the kingdom, several of whom were executed, were ordered to quit it within forty days (1584).

Several attempts had been set on foot for the liberation of the Queen of Scots, all of which had been detected and frustrated by the vigilance and energy of the English government, and, after nearly nineteen years of imprisonment, Mary learned that her fate was decided. She was removed to the castle of Fotheringhay, where she was put on trial (October 11, 1586) before a commission appointed for that purpose, charged with having conspired with foreigners for the double purpose of the invasion of the kingdom and the murder of the queen. The evidence against her purported to be copies of letters addressed by her to Babington, who had been some time previously executed for the same offense; but neither were the originals produced nor was there any satisfactory account given of how the copies came into the hands of the commission.[1] After a short consultation, the commission adjourned to meet in the Star Chamber, at Westminster, on

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. VIII., pp. 220–250. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

October 25th, when Mary, who was still in prison at Fotheringhay, was declared guilty of the crimes laid to her charge, and her execution demanded by parliament.

Elizabeth for a time dissembled her real feelings, apparently unwilling to shed the blood of her kinswoman, and in the hope that some of those who were so profuse in professions of loyalty to the crown and attachment to her person would spare her the ignominy of authorizing so infamous a deed. But on one point she had her mind fully made up: Mary *must* die; and, if it became necessary to take the responsibility of her execution upon herself, she would do so. Accordingly, she signed the death-warrant February 1, 1587, and seven days later the unfortunate Mary Stuart ascended the scaffold, and, placing her head upon the block, died with the dignity of a queen and the constancy of a martyr, professing to the last her firm belief in the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. She had asked as a last request that she might have the services of a Catholic priest in preparing herself for death, but this the commissioners sternly refused, adding, with brutal insolence, that to grant it would be to offend against the law of God and imperil their own souls. However, Mary was not without spiritual comfort in her last moments, for a Host, which had been consecrated by Pope Pius V., was secretly conveyed to her, despite the watchfulness of her persecutors. The executioner, lifting up the head he had just struck off, cried out: "God save Queen Elizabeth;" to which the fanatical Earl of Kent added: "So perish all the enemies of the Gospel," a speech which plainly laid open the true motives that had inspired the bloody deed.

But the violent hatred of their religion and vindictive persecution of themselves did not crush out in the bosom of Catholics the sentiments of patriotism and loyalty to the crown, and when either the honor or the interests of England were at stake, they were among the first to rush to her defense. When the "invincible armada" of Philip II. threatened the shores of England, Catholics answered the call of the queen no less promptly than their Protestant fellow-countrymen, with whom they stood shoulder to shoulder, ready to repel the hostile invaders. But neither their patriotism nor

Hosted by Google

their loyalty availed to obtain a mitigation of the horrors they were suffering. They continued all the same to be imprisoned, fined, tortured, hung, and quartered.

Elizabeth died in 1603, and was succeeded by the only son of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Lord Henry Darnley, *James I.* of England (1603–1625) and *VI.* of Scotland (1567–1625). On his elevation, the Catholics indulged the hope that they would now obtain some alleviation of their hardships, and it may be that James was disposed to treat them with clemency, if not with favor, but he dared not face the strong tide of public opinion that had set in against him. The fanaticism of the Puritans, who accused the king of favoring the enemies and persecuting the disciples of the Gospel, led to the revival of the penal law against *recusants*. The statutes of Elizabeth were again enforced, and the king, besides entering the Star Chamber and professing his detestation of Popery, issued a proclamation, banishing all Catholic missionaries from the land, and commanding all magistrates to see to it that the penal laws were put into immediate execution (1604). These persecutions, increasing in severity as time went on, at length led a number of bold, reckless, and misguided men, of whom Guy Fawkes has obtained the most permanent notoriety, to form the famous *Gunpowder Plot*, by which it was designed to blow up the king and the members of both houses of parliament. The mine was to have been fired on the meeting of parliament, toward the close of 1605, but the plot was fortunately discovered in time to prevent the perpetration of so monstrous and inhuman a crime. The conspirators were apprehended and executed; and among those to whose execution the Gunpowder Treason gave occasion, were a number of missionary priests, who had not the slightest knowledge of its existence, and *Father Garnet*, the Provincial of the Jesuits, whose only offense appears to have been an unwillingness to reveal what had been intrusted to him under seal of confession.[1]

The conspiracy furnished a pretext for fresh enactments against Catholics, more cruel and sanguinary than any that

[1] See *Scavini*, Theol. Mor. Univ., ed. Mediolan. 1860, Vol. III., p. 440. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

had yet disgraced English legislation. Because *thirteen* individuals had formed a diabolical plot for the destruction of those at whose hands some of them had suffered exceptional outrages, the whole Catholic body must be made to suffer the punishment of their guilt. A new penal code was drawn up by the concurrent action of both houses of parliament, and received the royal assent May 27, 1606. It ordained that Catholics should not dwell within ten miles of London, or go more than five miles from their homes without written leave from the neighboring magistrate; that they should be excluded from all civil offices and the learned professions; that husband and wife, unless married by a Protestant minister, could not derive the benefit which otherwise the one would be entitled to from the property of the other; and that if they failed to have a child baptized by a Protestant minister within a month after its birth, they should pay a fine of one hundred pounds; that every child sent to be educated on the Continent should be legally incapacitated from receiving inheritance or other devises until he should have conformed to the Established Church, refusing to do which his rights should pass to the Protestant next of kin; that every recusant should be regarded by the law as one excommunicated by name, and, in consequence, his house might be searched, and his books and furniture, if thought to have any connection with his religion, might be burnt, and his horses and arms taken from him; and, finally, that as a punishment for absence from the Established Worship, the king might, in his discretion, take either a fine of twenty pounds per lunar month, or all the personal property and two-thirds of the real estate of the recusant. A new oath of allegiance was prescribed, in which a distinction was drawn between those who admitted and those who denied the temporal claims of the Pope. The latter were subject only to the above penalties, and the former, in addition to these, were liable to perpetual imprisonment, confiscation of their personal property, and forfeiture during life of the revenue derived from their lands; but, if married women, they were to be confined in a common gaol until they would consent to take the oath. To avoid taking this oath, and escape the penalties of their refusal,

Hosted by Google

hundreds of Catholics crossed the Channel, and took up their residence on the Continent.[1] To perpetuate the remembrance of the Plot, and to keep alive and active the odium which attached to Catholics, in consequence of the atrocious wickedness of a few of their number, it was ordered that the 5th of November, the day of the discovery of the Treason, should be annually commemorated with unusual pomp,[2] and that a prayer should be inserted in the Liturgy imploring protection against "*cruel and bloodthirsty enemies.*"

The development of the principles of Protestantism in Scotland was the reverse of that which they assumed in England; for, while they led to the absolutism of the crown in the latter country, in the former they issued in the assertion of the *supremacy of the people.*

James, who was constantly repeating the maxim, "No bishop, no king," was anxious to preserve the episcopacy, believing it to be the firmest support of the throne; but, on the other hand, he hesitated to do justice to Catholics, fearing to bring upon himself the full fury of Presbyterian fanaticism. But the storm, which he dreaded to evoke, and succeeded in holding in check for a season, broke forth with terrific violence during the reign of his successor, *Charles I.* (1625–1649). The fanaticism of the *Puritans* or "*Saints*" grew daily more violent in England, till in the end it threatened not only the destruction of the Episcopacy, but the overthrow of the throne. These fanatical enthusiasts appealed to the Bible as authority for whatever they did, and claimed to find in it a sanction for the most atrocious crimes.

Charles was unfortunate throughout his whole reign. All his measures miscarried, and produced effects the very reverse of those intended. He was at variance with his parliament from the beginning of his reign. He set public opinion at

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. IX., pp. 21–74. (TR.)

[2] In most towns of England, but notably in London, one of the features of the celebration was a grotesque figure, stuffed with straw, representing Guy Fawkes, which was carried about the streets, and finally committed to the flames. During the "*No Popery*" cry of 1850, the performance was varied by the substitution and burning of the effigy of Cardinal Wiseman, instead of that of Guy Fawkes. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

defiance, and increased the popular discontent by selecting the Duke of Buckingham, his father's favorite, as his chief adviser and prime minister. He exasperated the Puritans in England and Presbyterians in Scotland by appointing Laud, a vehement and uncompromising Episcopalian, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and by making him, after the assassination of Buckingham, his chief counsellor. He wounded the prejudices and roused the indignation of the whole nation by marrying a Roman Catholic, Maria Henrietta of France. And, finally, he called forth a spirit of opposition, which he was never again able to lay, by dispensing for eleven years (1629–1640) with the aid of parliament in the government of the kingdom, and substituting in room of its authority his own despotic edicts and the arbitrary decisions of the Star Chamber.

"*No Popery*" became the rallying cry of the enemies of the king, and no display of severity on his part against the Catholics could satisfy their intolerant bigotry and insatiable craving for vengeance. The children of Catholics must be educated in the Protestant faith, and priests living in exile must be put to death if they ventured to visit the land of their fathers.

A partiality for extemporaneous preaching and a hatred of church government by bishops were the two distinguishing characteristics of the Church of Scotland; and hence, when King James attempted, in the year 1616, to force upon it a Service Book and a Code of Ecclesiastical Legislation, the attempt was successfully resisted. The scheme was revived by Charles I. in 1629, and a new Code of Ecclesiastical Law and a new Service Book were compiled, the latter of which received the royal approbation in 1636; but the Scotch churchmen again asserted their independence of the king in spiritual affairs, and their right to govern their Church and conduct their services as they thought fit. The royal party, who supported the claims of the king, were denounced from nearly every pulpit in Scotland as men who sought to "gag the Spirit of God and depose Christ from His throne." On July 23, 1637, when the Bishop of Edinburgh went to the principal church of the city to formally inaugurate the new

Hosted by Google

Service, he was greeted with groans and hisses and imprecations by the audience, which was chiefly composed of females, and a stool, thrown by one of the enthusiasts, narrowly missed his head. They cried out that the "Mass was again entered; that Baal was in the church;" and told the bishop that he was "a thief, a devil's get, and of a witch's breeding." Again and again the king commanded the use of the Service to be enforced, and again and again his command was resisted by the indignant fury of the populace. The opponents of the king's policy grew daily in numbers and influence, and toward the close of the year demanded the formal revocation of the Service Book and Code of Ecclesiastical Law. In the beginning of the year 1638 a more efficient mode of resistance was agreed upon. A *National Covenant*, drawn up at Edinburgh, and intended to serve the double purpose of a Confession of Faith and a bond for uniting the whole people in one formidable body of dissenters, was ratified by the leading *Presbyterian* ministers, and subscribed to by a great multitude of persons, representing every walk of life.[1]

The king, acting on the advice of some of his counsellors, resolved to put down the Covenanters by force; but being as yet unprepared for war, he sent the Marquis of Hamilton as his commissioner to Scotland, partly with a view to gain time and partly in the hope that the Scots might be won over by concessions. He proposed to them that if they would consent to disregard the Covenant and the obligations it imposed, the Service Book and the Book of Canons should be withdrawn, and those about to enter the ministry be excused from taking the oath of supremacy and canonical obedience. The Scots, who had secret information that Charles had no intention of acting in good faith, refused to accept the royal proposal, and resolved to maintain the Covenant.

At an assembly, which met at Glasgow November 21, 1638, the Kirk, out of which, it was said, there was no salvation, was declared independent in spiritual matters, the Episcopacy was abolished, the Service Book, the Ordinal, and the Book

[1] *Davidson*, Historical Sketch, Illustrative of the National Confession of Faith, Edinburgh, 1849. (Tr.) *Weber*, Hist. of the Non-Catholic Churches and Sects of Great Britain, Lps. 1845, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

of Canons were repudiated, and the bishops excommunicated and deposed. The proceedings of this assembly were annulled by Charles, and by the Scots received with transports of joy. Active preparations were at once made for war on both sides. The Scots began hostilities in March of the following year by the seizure of the castle of Edinburgh; and Charles, after vainly attempting to successfully oppose them, opened a conference with them at Berwick, in which, while refusing to recognize the proceedings of the assembly of Glasgow as legal, he proposed to leave the settlement of ecclesiastical questions to the decision of a general assembly, and that of civil matters to a parliament, both of which he would summon to convene in the month of August.[1]

At the assembly, which convened in Edinburgh in the following August, the king, dissembling his real feelings, reluctantly granted, through his representative, Traquaire, what it was no longer safe to refuse, and this happy consummation was hailed by the people of Scotland with shouts of triumph and prayers of thanksgiving. Charles returned to London, and summoned the parliament to meet (1640), in the hope that it would grant him the necessary supplies to carry on the war. The house of commons, however, declined to take any notice of the royal demands until the popular grievances should have been righted and the people's liberties guaranteed. The angry king hastily dissolved parliament, and sent an army against the Scots, which was defeated at Newburn-upon-Tyne. After this victory, the Scottish army, encouraged by the tokens of good-will everywhere manifested by the inhabitants, continued its march toward the south as far as the borders of Yorkshire. Charles was now compelled, much against his will, to again convoke parliament. The memorable sittings of this body, which is known in history as the "Long Parliament," lasted from 1640 to 1649. The two houses began their labors by asserting the liberties of the people and impeaching high officers of State. *Strafford* was brought to trial, condemned, and beheaded, and Archbishop *Laud* was cast into prison. Fresh demands were daily made upon the king, and

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. IX., pp. 354–367. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

new limitations put upon his prerogatives. Charles, conscious that the conflict between himself and his parliament would have to be submitted to the arbitration of arms, withdrew from London, and, on the 22d of August, 1642, unfurled the royal standard at Nottingham. The parliamentary leaders allied themselves with the Scotch *covenanters* "for the maintenance of the liberties of the Scotch Kirk and the reformation of the Church of England." In order to excite the prejudices and inflame the hatred of the people against the king and those who espoused his cause, they were branded as Papists by their opponents. In spite of the fact that Charles had had a number of priests put to death, it was reported, and generally believed, that the Catholics were conspiring in his favor. While the sufferings of the Catholics were many and terrible, those endured by the Episcopalians, if fewer and less rigorous, were still sufficiently aggravating to tax human patience to the utmost and to excite popular indignation against the persecutors. So intensely bitter was the feeling of the Presbyterians against the Established Church that, through their influence, its members were driven from their seats in parliament, and, if churchmen, deprived of their livings. The violence of the Presbyterians at length called forth a spirit of reaction in their own ranks, thus giving rise to a new party, known as the *Independents*, and recognizing *Fairfax* and *Oliver Cromwell* as their leaders. Admitting neither a priesthood nor a ministry, to which the office of preaching necessarily attached, they permitted any one, who believed himself moved by the Holy Ghost, to expound the word of God, a task which army officers, and even common soldiers, took upon them to perform. An army inspired with such enthusiasm, and led by a cool-headed, calculating general, was capable of extraordinary achievements, and hence the Parliamentarians, victorious throughout the whole struggle, crowned their triumph by a decisive victory over the king at the *battle of Naseby*, in May, 1645.

After a series of disasters, Charles attempted to make his escape from the country, which, failing to do, he gave himself up to the Scottish army, by whose authority he was transferred to the Parliamentarians, and by them cast into

Hosted by Google

prison at Holmby. Refusing to purchase his personal safety by a sacrifice of his principles and a surrender of his convictions, he was detained in prison until he was seized by the Independents, who wished to have possession of his person as a security against the hostile designs of the Presbyterians. In 1647, the king was transferred to Hampton Court, whence he escaped to the Isle of Wight, in the hope of being able to take passage in a vessel which the queen had sent from France to convey him thither. His design was frustrated by the vigilance and energy of the governor, and an uprising of the inhabitants of the island in his favor was instantly suppressed. Both houses of parliament passed a bill forbidding all further negotiations with the captive king, under penalty of high treason.

The power of the army was now at its height, and the "*Levellers*," a fanatical sect, which included among its numbers the bulk of the private soldiers and many of the officers, pretended to demonstrate from Holy Scripture that the principle of popular sovereignty was the only true basis of government, and that all kings were hateful to God. The recent victories gained by Cromwell over the Scots, who attempted to rescue the king (1648), assured the triumph of the *Radicals*. They demanded that Charles should be brought to trial "as a man of blood," who had done his "utmost against the Lord's cause and people in this poor nation." The Presbyterians, who refused to share the views of the Independents and act in harmony with their designs, were forcibly driven from their places in the house of commons, which, consisting now of only sixty members—*The Rump Parliament*—appointed a commission to try Charles on the charge of high treason, in that he had levied war against the Parliament of England. The king was brought to trial before the commission, assembled in Westminster Hall, and presided over by John Bradshaw, on the 20th of January, 1649. He received his sentence on the 27th, and three days later was beheaded.

The Commonwealth was now proclaimed in England. *Charles II.*, who had been recalled from the Continent, and crowned King of Scotland, after having been disastrously defeated by Cromwell at Worcester in 1651, made his escape

Hosted by Google

with some difficulty to France. This victory virtually made Cromwell supreme ruler of England; but, to give a color of legality to his acts, he was invested with the authority and title of *Lord Protector* by parliament in the year 1653.[1] The policy pursued by this extraordinary man, who was by nature always stern and frequently tyrannical, soon put a period to anarchy at home, and made his government respected abroad. He put down every attempt at resistance with an iron hand, and when he died, in 1658, peace reigned throughout the land, and all ranks professed to obey, if they did not respect, his authority. On his death, his eldest son, Richard, was proclaimed Protector by council; but destitute of the qualifications which fit one for so high and important an office, he was forced to resign in April, 1659, after holding his dignity little more than seven months; and in the following year *Charles II.* was invited from the Continent to assume the title and responsibilities of King of England. Charles being deeply impressed with the conviction, which seemed a sort of first principle with the members of the House of Stuart, that *episcopacy* is the upholder of the throne, had it again re-established both in England and in Scotland. This measure, besides being extremely unpopular, rendered the king suspected of being at heart a Catholic, and drew upon him the enmity of many. Cromwell had granted freedom of conscience to persons of every sect and shade of religious opinion, *excepting Catholics alone*, whose condition was not bettered under Charles II., notwithstanding that his brother, the Duke of York, was an earnest professor of the Catholic faith. They were accused of having been the authors of the great fire of London in 1666, and although there has never been produced a single shred of evidence in support of the charge, the lie is still perpetuated in an inscription on a monument erected in London to commemorate the disaster.

In the year 1673, a statute known as the "*Test Act*," and directed chiefly against James, Duke of York, passed the house of commons, ordaining that all persons should be de-

[1] *Villemain*, Histoire de Cromwell d'après les Mémoirs du Temps et les Recueils Parlementaires, Paris, 1819, 2 vols. *Ranke*, Vol. III.

Hosted by Google

clared incapable of holding any office of public trust, either civil or military, and be disqualified to sue in courts of law and equity, to act as guardians or executors, or to take any legacy or deed of gift, who should refuse to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, or decline to receive in public the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, and subscribe a declaration denying the doctrine of transubstantiation.[1] Every possible means was resorted to, no matter how infamous, to suppress Catholicism and rouse public indignation against its professors. *Lord Shaftesbury*, who had been mainly instrumental in having the "Test Act" passed, now pretended that he had private information of a "Popish Plot" to assassinate the king, massacre the Protestants, and burn the city of London, and that the conspirators, who were acting under the direction of the general of the Jesuits, included in their ranks nearly every Catholic in the kingdom. The Plot was the pure invention of one *Titus Oates* or *Ambrose*, a man of disreputable character, who, taking advantage of a few adventitious circumstances, contrived a story so plausible that it readily obtained credence in the then excited state of the public mind. The subject was brought before parliament. Oates was hailed as the savior of the Protestants, granted a pension of nine hundred pounds a year, and assigned a suite of apartments at Whitehall. By the aid of suborned witnesses and truculent juries, many innocent Roman Catholic gentlemen were convicted of complicity in the Plot, and died the death of traitors at the block, protesting their innocence with their last breath.

Charles II. was taken ill on February 2, 1685, and died four days later, after having made his peace with the Church of Rome, and received the consolations of her Sacraments.

Notwithstanding the existence of an *Exclusion Bill*, which had passed the house of commons, declaring James, Duke of York, debarred from inheriting the crown of England, he succeeded to his brother without opposition (1685). On the 4th of April, 1687, he published a *Declaration of Indulgence*,

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. XII., pp. 28, 190, 191. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

granting liberty of conscience and freedom of worship to all his subjects. Had he been content with doing this much, he might, in all probability, have greatly ameliorated the condition of his Catholic co-religionists, without imperiling his own title to the throne. But being a devout and zealous Catholic, he desired to restore that faith to its ancient ascendency, and, by his efforts to do so, alarmed the jealousy and alienated the affections of his Protestant subjects, and thus prepared the way for his speedy downfall. He renewed relations with Rome, and dispensed Catholics from the obligation of taking the Test Oath, thus removing their disqualifications for holding office. On the 27th of April, 1688, James again published his *Declaration of Indulgence*, with some slight additions, and ordered it to be read in all the churches of the kingdom. This many of the clergy refused to do, and seven of the bishops, who ventured on a written remonstrance, were committed to the Tower on the charge of seditious libel, tried and acquitted. The misfortunes of James culminated in the birth of a male heir apparent, known in history as "*The Pretender*," an event which, while bringing joy to the heart of the king, would, under different circumstances, have been hailed as a blessing by the nation. But now the prospect of a new line of Catholic rulers was viewed with apprehension by the discontented of every class, and with positive alarm by the holders of property formerly belonging to the Church. On the night of the 29th of June, 1688, the day of the acquittal of the bishops who had remonstrated in writing against reading the Declaration of Indulgence, and been indicted for libel in consequence, a message, signed by seven leading English politicians, was dispatched to *William, Prince of Orange*, begging him to come over to England and occupy the throne. William, who was then Stadtholder of the United Provinces, having married Mary, the daughter of James II., and a Protestant in religion, regarded his wife as the lawful heir to the English throne, and secretly favored every scheme for depriving her father of the crown. He accordingly accepted the invitation, and setting out with an army of fourteen thousand men, composed of English and Dutch, landed at Torbay, in Devonshire, November 5, 1688, and was hailed

Hosted by Google

as the "National Deliverer," come "to set the affairs of the realm in order." James, betrayed by his army and deserted by his children, after making a short, but ineffectual resistance, fled to France, and landed at Ambleteuse, December 25. His flight facilitated at once the triumph of his enemies, and furnished the chief ground of accusation against himself. He was declared to have abdicated the government, thereby leaving the throne vacant, and William and Mary were called to rule the English people as joint sovereigns. The date of their accession is coincident with the beginning of the "Protestant Ascendency." Catholics and those married to Catholics were forever declared incapable of wearing the crown of England; a new oath of allegiance was drawn up and prescribed; the right enjoyed by Catholics of appointing to livings was withdrawn from them, and bestowed upon the universities; and all Catholics, or those reputed to be such, were ordered not to approach within a distance of ten miles of London. An Act of Toleration, passed in the year 1698, granted liberty of conscience and freedom of worship to all except to *Socinians and Catholics*. The latter endured hardships the most rigorous, on account of their faith, being deprived of civil and political rights of every kind. Catholic schools were closed, and Catholic priests were hunted down. Such Catholic clergymen as consented to give up their faith and enter what was styled "*the one, true, saving, and apostolic Church of England*," received the gift of splendid livings as a reward of their apostasy. Any Catholic child, who went over to the Established Church, obtained in his own right, even during the lifetime of his parents, and to the exclusion of his brothers and sisters, the whole family inheritance.

That under such circumstances the Catholic faith did not become wholly extinct in Great Britain can be satisfactorily accounted for only by ascribing its preservation to the overruling guidance of its Divine Founder. This barbarous persecution was carried on without intermission or abatement throughout the whole course of the eighteenth century; and it required the fear inspired by the American War of Independence, and the dread of the contagious influence of the

Hosted by Google

French Revolution, to extort from either statesmen or high-church functionaries any amelioration of the Penal Laws directed against Catholics.

§ 330. *Protestantism in Scotland.*

J. Knox, Hist. of the Reform. of Scotland (till 1567), London, 1664, f. and often. *D. Calderwood*, Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland, London, 1678, fol., Edinb. 1845, 7 vols. *Gil. Stuart*, History of the Establishment of the Reformation in Scotland, London, 1780, 4to.; and The History of Scotland from the Establishment of the Reformation to the Death of Queen Mary. His object in this was to defend that unfortunate princess against Dr. Robertson and others. *G. Cook*, History of the Reformation in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1811, 3 vols., 8vo.; and History of the Church of Scotland, 3 vols., 8vo., 1815. *Wm. Bradshaw*, English Puritanism, containing the main opinions of the rigidest sort of those that went by that name in the realm of England, London, 1605 (Lat. trans., Puritanismus Anglicanus, Fref. 1610). *Wm. Robertson*, History of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1759, 2 vols. He passed over the earlier periods as "dark and fabulous." (Germ. tr., Brunswick, 2 pts.) *Keith* (Bishop), History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland, Edin. 1734, fol. *G. Chalmers*, Life of Mary, Queen of Scots, Lond. 1818, 2 vols., 4to.; 1822, 3 vols., 8vo. *P. F. Tytler*, The History of Scotland, Edin. 1828–1843, 9 vols. *M. Laing*, Hist. of Scotland, 4 vols.; remarkable only for its partiality and attacks upon the character of the unfortunate Mary. Her great defender, Prince *Labanoff*, Recueil des Lettres de Marie Stuart, London, 1844, 7 vols., 8vo.; from which Rev. *Donald McLeod* drew the Life of Mary, Queen of Scots, New York, 1857. *M. Teulet*, Papiers d' État relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Écosse, Paris, 1851–1860, 3 vols, 4to.; 1862, 5 vols., 8vo. Miss *Agnes Strickland*, Lives of the Queens of Scotland, Edin. 1850–1859, 8 vols., 8vo. *J. Cunningham*, Church History of Scotland, 2 vols. (from a Presbyterian point of view). *Geo. Grub*, Eccl. Hist. of Scotland, 4 vols. (from an Episcopalian point of view). *Burton*, Hist. of Scotland (with numerous notices of eccl. affairs). *T. Innes*, Law of Creeds in Scotland. *J. Skinner*, Eccl. Hist. of Scotland, London, 1818, 2 vols., 8vo. Analecta Scotia, illustr. the civil, eccl., and lit. Hist. of Scotland, Edinb. 1834–1837, 12 vols., 8vo. *J. A. Froude*, Hist. of England, New York, 1865, 12 vols. *Macaulay*, Hist. of England. *Stanley* (Dean of Westminster), Lectures on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland, New York, 1872. *Wm. von Schütz*, Mary Stuart, Mentz, 1839, 2 vols.; cf. concerning it Periodical of Historical Science, by *Neander*, year 1857. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. I., p. 457 sq.; Vol. III., p. 696 sq. *K. G. v. Rudloff*, Hist. of the Reform. in Scotland, Berlin, 1847–1849, 2 vols. *Koeslin*, The Church of Scotland and her Relation to the State, Hamburg, 1852. *W. M. Hetherington*, Hist. of the Church of Scotland till 1843, 4th ed., Edinb. 1853, 8vo.; 3d ed., New York, 1844, 8vo.

The introduction of the Reformation into Scotland was accompanied by deeds of exceptional atrocity. By an act of the Scotch parliament of 1525, the importation of books

Hosted by Google

treating of Lutheranism was prohibited, and all persons forbidden to take any other means of giving publicity to the Reformer's teachings. *Patrick Hamilton*, Abbot of Ferne, during a stay in the cities of Wittenberg and Marburg, had become acquainted with the principles of Lutheranism, and after his return home disregarded the prohibition of parliament, and began to propagate the new heresy. He was arrested, tried, and burnt at the stake, opposite St. Andrew's College, in February, 1528. Of those who followed in his footsteps, and continued to spread the teachings of Luther, some, like him, expiated their offense at the stake, while others fled either to England or the Continent. These cruelties, coming with ill grace from a corrupt clergy, who were themselves the objects of public derision and contempt, still further roused the fury of their adversaries, who soon took a bloody vengeance.

The inhabitants of the country gradually divided themselves into two hostile parties, which came into direct collision with each other in the year 1546. On the 28th of February of this year, *George Wishart*, the most eloquent of the Scotch Reformers, was arrested by the orders of *Cardinal Beaton*, the powerful Archbishop of St. Andrews, brought to trial, and burned at the stake.[1] On the 29th of the following May, a number of the Reform party, headed by *Norman Lesley*, attacked and murdered the cardinal, and seized and plundered his palace of St. Andrews, which became temporarily the stronghold of the Reformers.

But of all those who preached the teachings of the Reformation in Scotland, none achieved such successes as the impetuous and eloquent *John Knox*.[2] Brought up a Catholic, and

[1] It should be stated, however, that Wishart's complicity in a plot entered into by the more zealous of the Reformers for the assassination of Card. Beaton was the immediate occasion of his arrest.

[2] *Th. M'Crie*, Lives of John Knox and Andrew Melville, Edinburgh, 1811, 2 vols., and frequently ed.; in an abridgment by *Plank*, Göttingen, 1817 (panegyric). *Weber*, John Knox and the Scottish Church (Studies and Criticisms, nro. 4). *Brandes*, John Knox, the Reformer of Scotland, Elberfeld, 1862. (Lives and Select Writings of the Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church, Pt. X.)

Hosted by Google

educated for the service of the Church, he took priest's orders some time before 1530, and about twelve years later (1542) openly professed himself a Protestant. Hearing of the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, he gave it as his opinion, that the deed had been of divine inspiration. He took up his residence at the castle of St. Andrew's, after its capture by the Reformers, and in 1547 began his career as a preacher in the parish church of the same name by an intemperate denunciation of the errors of Popery. When the fortress was taken by the royal troops, *Knox*, being one of the captured prisoners, was conducted across to France, where he spent nearly two years in the galleys. Returning to England, he again began to preach; was appointed one of the chaplains to Edward VI.; fell in love, and was married. When Mary succeeded to the throne of England, Knox, with others of the Reformers, withdrew to the Continent. He spent some time at Dieppe, Geneva, and Frankfort-on-the-Main; made a short visit to Scotland to encourage the Reformers (1555), and returned to Geneva (1556), where he passed nearly three years in charge of a church, and became a thorough-going Calvinist.

Affairs in Scotland seemed to conspire to favor the Reformers. The weak and vain *Earl of Arran*, who became regent on the death of James V., in 1542, was quite content to allow the innovators to have their own way, provided only the prosecution of their plans did not lead to open rebellion. When Mary succeeded to the throne, she saw herself condemned to be an idle spectator of the uninterrupted progress of the new teachings, which had been propagated chiefly by English refugees, who sought an asylum in Scotland, after the accession of Mary Tudor to the throne (1553), and of whom John Willock was the most distinguished. A *Synod* convened in Edinburgh in 1549 to provide measures for the removal of the ignorance and the correction of the morals of the Scottish clergy, but it was already too late to effect any good. Among his other labors, Knox occupied himself during his stay at Geneva in writing a work, published in 1558, entitled "*The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regimen of*

Hosted by Google

Women," being a violent attack upon Mary of Guise, Regent of Scotland, and Mary Tudor, Queen of England.

From Geneva, Knox kept up an active correspondence with his partisans in Scotland, whom he counseled to employ force, should other means fail, for the suppression of an idolatrous worship and the overthrow of an idolatrous government. He was fond of repeating that, "*by no other means were owls so effectually frightened away as by burning their nests.*" The passions of the multitude, which had been recently aroused by the burning of *Walter Milne*, an apostate priest, were still further inflamed when, in 1559, Knox was recalled to Scotland, and began to preach against the idolatry of the Mass and the veneration of images. The "rascal multitude," as Knox afterward called those who only put his precepts into practice, roused to fury by the fiery denunciations he had launched against an idolatrous worship, proceeded to demolish the images and tear and trample under foot the pictures in the churches of the city of Perth, and sack and lay in ruins the houses of the Franciscan and Dominican friars and the monastery of the Carthusians. Similar outrages were perpetrated in other cities of Scotland. The inauguration of the Reformed Religion was always preceded by the sacking of churches, the destruction of images, and the utter demolition of whatever in any way referred to the Mass, or had any connection with the veneration of Saints. The Scottish Reformers, with a view to centralizing their power, formed a covenant, which came to be known as the *Congregation*, and its leaders as *Lords of the Congregation*. Between that portion of the population represented by this body and assisted by *Elizabeth*, Queen of England, and the adherents of the queen-regent, assisted by the King of France, a civil war of twelve months' duration was carried on, which was characterized by incidents of unusual atrocity. While the English troops were investing Edinburgh, the queen-regent died, after which both parties agreed to a truce, during which it was arranged to summon a parliament, to whose action the settlement of their difficulties should be left. The parliament, which assembled in August, 1560, declared the Reformed the established religion of Scotland, and interdicted Catholic worship.

Hosted by Google

When, therefore, *Mary Stuart*, after the death of her husband, *Francis II.*, Dauphin of France, returned to Scotland, August 21, 1561, to enter upon the government of that kingdom, she found her religion, to which she was devotedly attached, abolished, and the penalty of confiscation and death decreed against any one who should hear Mass. The old Catholic faith had been replaced by a rigid *Calvinism*, and the *episcopal* form of church government by that of *Presbyters*, belonging to the "Community of the Saints."[1] This democratic system was applied to politics as well as religion. Under these circumstances, Mary Stuart, while refusing to formally concede all the claims put forward by the victorious Reformers, was, nevertheless, content to leave matters as she found them, and even condescended to gratify their wishes in everything consistent with her duty as a Catholic and her dignity as a queen. Disregarding the counsels of the more zealous of the Roman Catholics, she selected her advisers from among the Protestants, and appointed as her minister of state her illegitimate brother, *James Stuart*, an ambitious and able statesman, whom she afterward created *Earl of Murray*. But, while granting freedom of worship to others, she claimed for herself the liberty of hearing Mass said in the chapel of the castle of Edinburgh, a concession which Knox and others of the extreme Reformers denounced as an offense against the law of God, which would inevitably draw down the divine vengeance upon the whole land. "I had rather," said Knox, "face ten thousand enemies than know that one Mass is said in Scotland." So violent were his denunciations, and so effective in their results, that when Mary made her solemn entrance into Edinburgh, the city council issued a proclamation, expelling from the city "the whole wicked rabble of Antichrist and the Pope, to wit, priests, monks, lay-brothers, fornicators, and adulterers." While the manners of Mary's court were not

[1] "The government and discipline of the Church rest, on the Presbyterian theory, with collective bodies of teaching (or clerical) elders, generally called 'ministers,' and ruling (or lay) elders, who are generally meant when 'elders' are spoken of, gathered in Synods, and not with individual persons, as in the Episcopal system, or with individual congregations, as in the Independent system." *Blunt*, Dict. of Heresies, etc., art. "Presbyterians." (TR.)

Hosted by Google

of that stern and gloomy severity which the Scotch Reformers affected, it must also be admitted that, in their judgments of her, they were harsh and unjust, rather than equitable and tolerant. Knox, who was fully alive to the impression which her singular beauty and attractive address would make upon those with whom she came in contact, resolved to counteract any influence she might derive from her personal graces and charm of manner by coarse invectives against her policy and indelicate insinuations against her character. Her marriage with her cousin, Henry Stewart, Lord *Darnley*, son of the Earl of Lennox, whose whole family were reputed zealous Catholics, he had the indecent effrontery to liken to the union between Ahab and Jezebel. This marriage, which was celebrated at Holyrood, July 29, 1565, though perfectly honorable, was disastrous in its consequences. It was the occasion of a revolt, headed by Murray and the Hamiltons, who, disappointed in their hopes of assistance from the Protestants, were defeated by the forces of the queen, who had taken the field in person against them. Mary now began to awake to the fact that her marriage with Darnley had been a mistake. His morals were dissolute, his arrogance intolerant, and his ambition boundless. But, while he possessed all the vices, he had none of the virtues of a strong character. He had received from Mary the title of king; but, not content with this, demanded that the crown should be secured to him for life, and that in the event of the queen's dying without issue, it should descend to his heirs. His demands having been refused, he entered into a conspiracy with Murray, Morton, and others of the Protestant leaders, for the murder of Riccio, Mary's secretary, who, he persuaded them, was the real obstacle to the accomplishment of his wishes. Entering the queen's apartments, the assassins, headed by the king, seized the poor Italian, dragged him into the ante-chamber, and dispatched him with more than fifty wounds (March 9, 1566). Speaking of this atrocious and cowardly murder, the pious Knox said it was "a just act and worthy of all praise." The queen succeeded, by kind attentions and demonstrations of love, in detaching her husband from the conspirators; but, although her affection for him seemed to revive as the time

Hosted by Google

of her confinement drew near, she was again soon alienated from him. Darnley was taken ill of the small-pox at Glasgow toward the middle of January, 1567. He was removed thence to Edinburgh, where he was lodged in a small house beside the Kirk of the Field. This house was blown up by gunpowder on the night of the 9th of February, and Darnley's lifeless body found in the neighboring garden. Notwithstanding that Mary visited him daily while here, spending some whole nights under the same roof, and showing him every attention and kindness, she has been accused of complicity in his murder, although no satisfactory evidence of her guilt has ever been produced. Bothwell was generally believed to have been at the bottom of the plot, and Mary's marriage to him, only three months after the murder of her late husband, in spite of the fact that she had been abducted by violence, and her consent extorted by force, gave color of truth to the damaging suspicions that were put in circulation by her enemies.

This fatal step was speedily followed by disaster. A faction, including many of the nobility of Scotland, and headed by Earl Murray, rose in arms; and unable to hold out against them, she was forced to surrender herself a prisoner into their hands. She was prevailed upon while a captive to sign an act of abdication in favor of her son, *James*, then only thirteen months of age, which she did at Lochleven, July 24th. Murray was named regent during the minority of the young king, and bound himself by oath to extirpate the enemies of the Gospel from Scotland. Accused of adultery and complicity in the assassination of Darnley, and vanquished by her enemies, Mary committed the fatal blunder of accepting the proffered hospitality of Elizabeth of England, her most inveterate enemy, from whose hands she never escaped.[1]

The pious and rebellious Knox died in 1572, confessing that he was "wearied of the world," and his place was filled by another Reformer, quite as radical and fanatical as himself, named *Andrew Melville*. *James VI.* succeeded to the government of the kingdom in 1578, and, true to the traditionary

[1] *Fred. v. Raumer*, Elizabeth and Mary, Lps. 1836.

Hosted by Google

policy of the House of Stuart, did what he could to strengthen the authority of the *Episcopacy*. His efforts, however, were frustrated by the boldness and energy of the Presbyterians. The general assembly of 1581 commanded all bishops to resign their sees, and forbade them to exercise any episcopal function, under penalty of banishment from the kingdom. By an act of parliament of the year 1584, the Episcopacy was again re-established, and all attempts against the royal person declared high treason.

But now that James had the sanction of parliament for the restoration of the Episcopacy, he lacked the power to carry the act into execution, and was once more obliged to yield to the demands of the Presbyterians, whose system of church government was legalized by parliament in 1592. The bishops, while permitted to retain their seats in parliament, were deprived of all right to exercise ecclesiastical functions, and forbidden to bear the title of bishop.

In spite of the persistent persecution directed against the Catholic religion in Scotland, it never quite disappeared from the land; and, after maintaining itself in obscurity for centuries in the Highlands, has been steadily gaining ground, and making notable progress in these latter days.

§ 331. *Protestantism in Ireland.*

Thos. Moore, Memoirs of Captain Rock, ed. 1824 and 1852. The *same*, History of Ireland, forming 4 vols. of Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopaedia, 1839–1846. *O'Connell*, A Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon, 1 vol., 8vo., Dublin, 1843. Ireland's Situation, from an ecclesiastical point of view, in the *Tübingen Quarterly Review*, year 1840, pp. 549 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. V., pp. 490 sq. *Thos. Darcy M'Gee*, Hist. of the Attempt to Establish the Protestant Reformation in Ireland, Boston, 1853. *Brenan, O. S. F.*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Dublin, 1864. *W. D. Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, London, 1875.

The very name of Ireland is associated in the mind with civil and religious persecution.

The first attempts to rob Ireland of her independence and her people of their freedom date back to the reign of Henry II., in 1166. Those districts, occupied at different times by the English settlers, were known under the general name of "the Pale," the geographical limit of which varied with the fortunes of the English arms in Ireland. From the inhabit-

Hosted by Google

ants of the Pale, the members of the so-called Irish parliament into whose hands the destinies of the nation were committed, were selected. Once Henry VIII. had made up his mind to become supreme spiritual head of the Church of England, he was equally anxious to enjoy the same title and authority in Ireland. The archiepiscopal see of Dublin falling vacant, Cromwell appointed to it one George Brown (1535), then provincial of the Order of Augustinians in England, and formerly a Lutheran. Having arrived in Dublin, he and the commissioners from Henry VIII., who accompanied him, summoned some of the bishops and nobles to the castle of Dublin, and called on them to subscribe to the supremacy of the king in the spiritual affairs of the Church of Ireland. *George Cormer*, Primate of Ireland, indignantly repelled such a claim, and summoning the Episcopacy of the country before him, called on them to resist to the last this attempt to open a schism in the Irish Church. This scheme failing, Lord Grey, the deputy, called the parliament to meet at Dublin, May 1, 1536, and by this body Henry VIII. was declared "sole and supreme head on earth of the Church of Ireland,"[1] the Pope's jurisdiction renounced, and all who should maintain it rendered subject to the penalties of *praemunire*.[2]

[1] *Brenan*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Dublin, 1864, pp. 392-393. (TR.) In a letter, dated September, 1535, written by Archbishop Browne to Cromwell, the writer says: "He had endeavored, almost to the hazard of his life, to reduce the nobility and gentry of Ireland to due obedience in owning the king their supreme head, as well spiritual as temporal; but that he was much opposed therein, especially by Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, who had laid a curse on the people whoever should own the king's supremacy, and had thereby drawn to him the most of his suffragans and clergy within his jurisdiction; that the archbishop and priests of Armagh had sent two messengers to Rome, and that it was feared O'Neill (the great chief of Ulster) would be ordered by the Pope to oppose the changes." *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, London, 1875, Vol. I., pp. 338-339. This writer is a Protestant, and shows the animus of a bigoted partisan. (TR.)

[2] "All officials of every class were required to take the oath of supremacy, and all who refused were declared guilty of high treason. Several of the old penal laws were revived. Marriage and fostering with the Irish were forbidden, and throughout the Pale the English language and habit were strictly enjoined. A law was made for the establishment of an English school in every district." *Killen*, l. c., pp. 339-340. Of Archbishop Browne, through whose exertions the Statute of Supremacy was passed, the same writer says: "In-

Hosted by Google

The royal supremacy was recognized by a few sordid bishops and priests, who set more value upon the goods of this world than upon their own salvation in the next;[1] and some of the Irish chieftains were won over by royal favor and bounty. But the great bulk of the Irish people opposed a vigorous and persevering resistance to the progress of the Reformation, being unable to comprehend in what the belief of men, who entered the country crying "Death to the Irish," could be superior to their own ancient faith, which counseled peace and good-will to all. Preachers were brought over from England, and the English liturgy introduced, with a view to facilitate and hasten the work of the Reformation in Ireland; but, strange to say, the results that followed were the reverse of what had been anticipated.

The resistance of the Irish to the new teachings grew daily more pronounced and energetic. Every royal artifice and every display of kingly power, designed to alienate their affections from the ancient faith, failed utterly of their purpose. In vain did an Anglo-Irish parliament, held at Dublin in 1542, proclaim Henry "*King of Ireland;*" in vain were peerages conferred upon some of the native princes. The absence of the bishops from the parliament was significant of the temper of the country, and no attempt was made by the natives to disguise their hostility to all foreign domination. Even the representatives of those English families that had been long settled in the land spurned the new teachings as contemptuously as did the ancient Irish. A new dynasty had indeed been thrust upon the country; but, instead of inspiring love, it called forth the execrations of the people, who from that day forth have never ceased to regard the cause of their national independence and the cause of their religion as in-

stead of insisting that at least a portion of them (the spoils of the dissolved abbeys) should be employed in promoting the general enlightenment of the people, he solicits once and again for a share to himself, though he already enjoyed a very ample income." Ibid., l. c., p. 341. Such has always been the character of the men who have felt themselves called to improve upon the work of God, and supply the shortcomings of his censurable neglect. (TR.)

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 394. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

separably bound up together, and to view an attack on the one as a menace against the other.

On the accession of Edward VI., the Duke of Somerset, the protector, issued a proclamation in the king's name, ordaining that the Liturgy of the Church of England should be introduced into all places of worship, and commanding all bishops and priests to yield obedience to the royal will. George Brown,[1] Archbishop of Dublin, obeyed with alacrity, and on Easter Sunday, 1551, had the new service read in the Cathedral of Christ's Church in his own presence. The other bishops of the country, proving less pliable than the servile Brown, were commanded by the viceroy, Sir Anthony St. Leger, to come up to Dublin, where, assembled in the council chamber, they listened to the reading of the royal proclamation. When it was ended, *George Dowdall*, Primate of Armagh, rose up, and, after having protested against its instructions as dangerous and unwarrantable innovations, abruptly left the chamber, followed by all the clergy, with the exception of Brown, of Dublin; Staples, Bishop of Meath; and John Bale, a Carmelite, who, as a reward for his apostasy, was afterward thrust by royal power into the See of Ossory,[2] whence he was expelled, after a short stay, by the fury of an outraged people. The dignified and manly course of Dowdall was too great an offense to go unpunished, and he was accordingly deprived of his see, and an Englishman, named *Goodacre*, appointed in his place. The title of Primate of all Ireland was also withdrawn from the See of Armagh, and conferred upon that of Dublin, as an additional recompense to Brown for his many virtues and his still more numerous

[1] It would appear that this archbishop, who was so inveterate an enemy of superstition that his zeal led him to cast into the fire the crozier, known as the *Staff of Jesus*, which well authenticated tradition said had belonged to St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, and for eleven hundred years had been held in veneration as one of Ireland's most precious relics, was not himself very fond of missionary work. *Killen*, the Protestant historian of the Irish Church, informs us that "his sermons could not have occupied more than from *eight* to *ten* minutes each in the delivery," and that "he preached only *twice* in the year." l. c., Vol. I., p. 341, note 3, and p. 365, note 1. (Tr.)

[2] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 398. It is remarkable that these apostates were Englishmen. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

services in the cause of reform. Every means that human ingenuity could devise, or human power execute, was now brought into play to induce the Irish clergy and people to prove recreant to the venerable faith of their fathers. Threats, bribes, flattery, promises of wealth, honors, and distinctions, all served their turn, and all were contemptuously rejected or disregarded. Of the Irish Episcopacy, except those already mentioned, *Magenis*, Bishop of Down, and *Burke*, Bishop of Clonfert, were alone found willing to give up their faith from motives of avarice. A few Irish priests also apostatized, and received mitres as a recompense for their dishonor.[1]

Edward VI. died in 1553, and on the 6th of July of the same year *Mary* succeeded to the throne. During her reign the Catholics of Ireland enjoyed a short respite from the persecutions of the preceding one. Priests came forth from their places of concealment, where they had sought a refuge to escape the fury of their pursuers; churches and chapels that had been closed or desecrated were again opened and restored to their ancient uses; George Dowdall, who had retired to the Continent, returned and took possession of his See of Armagh; Brown, Staples, Lancaster, and Travers were deposed, and the same fate would have overtaken Casey and Bale had they not prudently retired of their own accord; immoral ecclesiastics were punished; pastors were again set over their flocks; and order, morality, and religion once more held empire over the hearts of a faithful people. It is a signal proof of the humanity and forgiving temper of the Irish race that, notwithstanding the indignities and atrocities endured by them during the preceding reign, this complete change was brought about without the shedding of a single drop of blood. For the purpose of reforming what needed reformation in the Irish Church, Archbishop Dowdall called a National Synod, which convened at Drogheda (1554), and was attended by nearly all the Catholic bishops of the country. Here several decrees were made, restoring ancient practices of the Church that

[1] Only three are mentioned, says *Brenan*, l. c., in our authentic annals, namely: Robert Travers, Thomas Lancaster, and William Casey. The first became Bishop of Leighlin; the second Bishop of Kildare; and the third Bishop of Limerick. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

had fallen into disuse, and providing for the correction or punishment of immoral ecclesiastics.[1] In May, 1556, Viscount Fitzwalter entered upon his duties as viceroy, and in July of the same year parliament met in Dublin. An act was passed by this parliament, setting forth that the title of "Supreme Head of the Church" could not "be justly attributable to any king or governor," and that the Holy See should "have and enjoy the same authority and jurisdiction" as had been lawfully exercised by His Holiness the Pope during the early part of the reign of Henry VIII.[2]

Protestantism was now nearly extinct in Ireland, there being only three or four reformed preachers in the land,[3] and the future of the Catholic Church seemed full of hope and promise, when the whole aspect of affairs was changed by the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth (1558). During this and succeeding reigns a violent persecution was carried on against the Irish Catholics, so cold-blooded, systematic, and atrocious that, since the time of the Pharaohs, the world has seen nothing comparable to it. Violence was practiced under the forms of law; brute force was employed where other means failed; and to attempt any resistance, even in defense of the most sacred rights, was declared an act of high treason. Such, with the exception of short seasons of peace, occurring at long intervals, was the normal condition of Ireland for three centuries. To hold that country dependent on England, the people were kept in a chronic state of insurrection, and the ministers of Elizabeth did not attempt to conceal that they practiced so infamous a means for so iniquitous a purpose. When, goaded to desperation, the people rose in rebellion, they were put down by fire and sword, and the work of destruction was completed by the ravages of famine. But while this policy carried ruin and death to the people, it secured no solid advantages to Protestantism, in whose interest it was inaugurated, notwithstanding that Catholic bishops and priests were driven from their sees and parishes, their goods

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 401–404. (TR.)
[2] The 3d and 4th of Philip and Mary, chap. VIII., as quoted by *Killen*. (TR.)
[3] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 365. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

confiscated, and they themselves either banished the country or put to death.

In the year 1559, Thomas, Earl of Sussex, acting on the order of his sovereign, summoned the Irish parliament to meet in Dublin. This assembly, from which the Catholic nobles were carefully excluded, is described by Hooker as "more like a bear-beating of disorderly persons than a parliament of wise and grave men."[1] Still agitators of this character, whose undignified conduct excited the contempt of their own apologists, ordained that the Book of Common Prayer should be used in all places of public worship. If a priest celebrated the Lord's Supper, either publicly or in private, in any manner other than that laid down in the Liturgy of the Church of England, he was condemned to forfeit a year's income and be imprisoned six months for the first offense; to forfeit his income forever and be imprisoned at pleasure for the second; and for the third to be imprisoned during the term of his natural life. Laymen using any form of worship other than that contained in the Book of Common Prayer were sent to prison for one year for the first, and for life for the second offense; and all persons, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, holding livings or offices, were ordered to come forward, under penalty of deprivation and forfeiture, and take the oath of Supremacy.[2]

Speaking of the character of the men who went over to Ireland to introduce the Reformation into that country, Spenser, himself a Protestant, and an eye-witness of what he attests, says: "Whatever disorders you see in the Established Church through England, you may find here, and many more, namely, *grosse simony, greedy covetousness, fleshy incontinency, carelesse sloath, and generally all disordered life in the common clergyman.*"[3]

The legislation already in operation proving ineffectual to prevent the Catholic clergy of Ireland from providing for the interests of the Church by secret meetings held in Dublin,

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 404. (TR.)

[2] Lib. Stat., p. 201, quoted by *Brenan*, l. c., p. 405. (TR.)

[3] *Spenser*, pp. 139–140, quoted by *Brenan*, l. c., p. 405. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

the Earl of Essex issued a proclamation in 1563, forbidding all priests, whether secular or regular, either to meet or reside in the city, and republished a former edict, commanding all heads of families to attend Protestant service every Sunday. Another addition was shortly after made to the proclamation of 1559, summoning every individual in the country to come forward and acknowledge the Spiritual Supremacy of Elizabeth.[1] But, though every means that great wealth and irresistible power could command was brought into play to break the spirit and shake the faith of the Irish people and clergy, they continued steadfast and loyal to the Church of their fathers; and of the episcopacy, only two, *Miler Magrath*, Bishop of Down, and *Hugh Curwin*, an Englishman, who had been appointed by Mary to the archiepiscopal See of Dublin in the room of Brown, proved recreant to their trusts and traitors to their God. The defection of these two bishops was, however, amply atoned for by the heroic constancy and glorious martyrdom of numerous others. *Dermot O'Hurley*, Archbishop of Cashel, was tied to a stake and his body covered with pitch, salt, oil, and sulphur; after which a slow fire was started, and managed with such a refinement of barbaric skill and civilized cruelty, that the victim was made to endure the inhuman torture for hours without being permitted to expire. He was then cast into prison, but only to be brought forth the next day and strangled on the rack in Stephen's Green, Dublin, 1583.[2]

Patrick O'Hely, Bishop of Mayo, was stretched on a rack; his hands and feet broken with hammers; large needles driven violently under his nails; and, after enduring these barbarities for some time, was taken from the rack only to be hung from the limb of a neighboring tree (1578).[3]

Richard Creach, Archbishop of Armagh, was carried to London and confined in the Tower. He was brought forth for trial, and confronted with a young lady, the daughter of the gaoler, who had been suborned to testify that he had attempted to outrage her person. Summoned to the witness-stand, the

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 407. (Tr.)

[2] *Analecta sacra*, appendix, p. 7. (Tr.)

[3] *Arthur a Monasterio*, in suo Martyrologio, quoted by *Brenan*, l. c., p. 415. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

young woman, startled at the injustice of her purpose, and yielding to the promptings of her better nature, openly confessed that the good prelate was wholly innocent of the crime his enemies were desirous of fastening upon him. But these men cared not whether he was innocent or guilty; they sought only his life, and of that they would not be baffled. He was again sent to the Tower, where he was chained like a wild beast; and, after undergoing every sort of suffering and privation for above four years, was finally poisoned October 14, 1585.[1] The sufferings of these illustrious men, than whom Ireland has no greater saints in her long catalogue of martyrs, may serve as specimens to show what the Irish had to endure to keep the faith. The record of their lives is as proud a page as there is in the history of any people; and those historians who are assiduously ransacking the annals of the Spanish Inquisition for examples of inhuman atrocity can find them more conveniently and certainly in a more aggravated form by turning to the history of the Reformation in Ireland.[2]

To utterly root up and destroy the Catholic faith in Ireland, its seminaries and its colleges were closed by law; Catholic education, whether public or private, proscribed throughout the whole island; and those desiring to acquire a liberal education could do so only by either giving up their faith or crossing over to the Continent, where the munificent hospitality of strangers opened seats of learning for the Irish youth, which in some sort supplied the advantages furnished by those that had been closed against them at home.[3]

[1] *Analecta sacra* de rebus Cath. Hib. de Processu Martyr., pp. 46 sq. (Tr.)

[2] For particulars of the lives of these men, and many more, the reader is referred to *Brenan.* (Tr.)

[3] The Irish seminary at Lisbon, which was munificently endowed, was founded in 1595. Another was founded about the same time at Evora by Cardinal Henriquez. The Irish college of Douay was founded in 1596. Through the exertions of Christopher Cusack, a priest of the diocese of Meath, colleges were founded at Lisle, Antwerp, Tournay, and St. Omer. Seminaries were founded at Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Nantes, under the patronage of Anne of Austria. The Irish college on the hill of Ste. Geneviève, in Paris, was the gift of the French government, and Baron de St. Just was its chief benefactor. In 1582, the College of Salamanca was founded by the States of Castile and Leon, under

Hosted by Google

The accession of *James I.* to the throne of England led the Irish to hope that they might look for at least a scant measure of justice from the son of Mary Stuart, and count upon the free exercise of their religion during his reign. That this hope was fallacious they learned when James proclaimed an act of oblivion and indemnity, and excluded by name from the benefits of its provisions only "*Papists and assassins.*" A petition, carried to the king in 1603, begging freedom of religious worship for Catholics, was treated with contempt, and the bearers of it sent to prison in the Tower. On July 4, 1605, a royal ordinance was published, declaring all the enactments of the reign of Elizabeth in force, to which the king added that "no toleration shall ever be granted by us; and this," he went on to say, "we do for the purpose of cutting off all hope that any other religion shall ever be allowed, save that which is consonant to the *laws* and *statutes* of this realm."[1] This ordinance required "all Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests whatsoever, to depart out of the kingdom of Ireland" before the ensuing 10th of December.[2]

During the reign of Elizabeth an unsuccessful attempt had been made to render the native Irish strangers in their own land and among their own people. It was proposed to send over English and Scotch colonists, who should take possession of the lands in various districts and settle permanently in the country. The scheme was again taken up by James, to whom an excellent opportunity of carrying it into effect was presented when the property of the three powerful chiefs of Ulster, namely, Tyrone, Tyrconnel, and O'Dogherty, escheated to the crown. Their estates, it is said, included nearly the whole of the six northern counties of Cavan, Fermanagh, Armagh, Derry, Tyrone, and Tyrconnel, and embraced two millions of acres.[3] When insurrections did not

---

the patronage of Philip II. Baron George Sylveria founded the Irish college at Alcalá de Henares, which, being richly endowed, was the great nursery of Irish missionaries during the seventeenth century. *Brenan*, l. c., p. 423. (Tr.)

[1] *O'Daly*, Relatio Persec. Hib., p. 232. (Tr.)

[2] *Calendar of State Papers*, James I., 1606–1608, Pref. 60–61; also *Burke's* Hibernia Dominicana, pp. 611–612. (Tr.)

[3] This project, known as the *Ulster Plantation*, was carried out with great

Hosted by Google

break out with sufficient frequency to satisfy the greed of the avaricious agents of government, it was pretended that the pacification of Ireland required a periodical revision of titles to the possession of land. It was not to be expected that in a country so long and so violently convulsed all titles should be without flaw; and it is certain that wherever defects existed, they did not escape the keen and practiced eyes of the government lawyers. That the lord chief-justice and the viceroy fully appreciated their opportunity, their zeal in hunting up defective titles, and their avidity in seizing the property for which no clear claim could be established, amply attest. In some instances, where the jury resolutely refused to do the bidding of the viceroy, they were summoned to Dublin, heavily fined, and cast into prison.[1]

These persecutions were kept up throughout the whole of the reign of James, and continued with increased violence under that of his successor, *Charles I.* (1625–1649). When this prince ascended the throne, it was hoped he would deal justly with the people of Ireland, and grant to them the same freedom of worship he allowed to his Catholic queen, Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. of France. This would probably have been his policy had he not inherited the weak and halting character so peculiar to the house of Stuart, and been surrounded by wicked and bigoted advisers. Accordingly, when the Catholics began to practice their religion openly, the Irish Protestant hierarchy, headed by the Archbishop Usher, took the alarm, and protested against a grant of graces, as they were called, which the king promised the

skill. The lands to be "planted" were parceled out into tracts of one thousand, fifteen hundred, and two thousand acres each, and given to Protestant settlers from England and Scotland, who were required to build castles or large houses, capable of being defended, in strong and commanding positions. The natives were permitted to take up their residence in the open country, under the control and at the mercy of the English and Scotch "undertakers and servitors," or capitalists and military officers. These latter were obliged to take the oath of supremacy, and to exclude any tenant not of British origin. *Lingard*, Hist. of England, London, 1849, Vol. IX., pp. 148, 149. *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, London, 1875, Vol. I., p. 482. (Tr.)

[1] *Thos. Moore*, Memoirs, Book I., ch. 7, notes 26–28. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 29. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Catholics in return for the payment of a certain sum of money. The Protestants went on to say that it would be "a grievous sin" to permit Catholics the "free exercise of their religion," because to do so would be to give the sanction of government to superstition, idolatry, and heresy, and to barter for money souls redeemed by the blood of Christ.[1]

The king yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon him by the Protestant bishops of Ireland, and in 1629 the statutes against Catholics were once more revived.[2] Lord Falkland, who was then Viceroy of Ireland, unwilling to carry out the iniquitous and fraudulent policy of the government, was recalled, and Lord Wentworth, afterward *Earl of Strafford*, was appointed in his place in January, 1632. That Wentworth was a man of great ability and eminent talents there can be no doubt;[3] and there is just as little doubt that he prostituted in the service of the devil the splendid gifts he had received from God. Once the uncompromising champion of the rights of the people, he had now become the uncompromising champion of the claims of the king. Possessed of great courage and tenacity of purpose, and destitute of every humane feeling and conscientious scruple, he was appalled by no consideration of guilt in the conception of his measures, and was deterred by no obstacle in their execution. The leading and

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. IX., pp. 335, 336. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 3, 4. *Brenan*, l. c., p. 453. (TR.)

[2] The character of these bishops, who were so zealous in putting down what they were pleased to call "superstition," is given in a letter of remonstrance, addressed to the four archbishops by the king in April, 1630. "The clergy," he said, "were not so careful as they ought to be . . . in removing all pretenses to scandal in their lives and conversation." "When livings fall vacant," "some bishops" "do either not dispose of them so soon as they should, *but do keep the profits in their own hands*, to the hindrance of God's service and great offense of good people, or else they give them to young and mean men, which only bear the name, *reserving the greatest part of the benefice to themselves*." *Erlington's* Life of Usher, pp. 106–108.

Coyne, in his Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Bedell, pp. 34, 35, says Thomas Moygne, the Protestant predecessor of Bedell in the See of Kilmore, treated "all things spiritual and temporal belonging to the episcopacy" as if they "had been ordinarily vendible commodities;" even "*orders and livings*" being "sold to those that could pay the greatest prices." See *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 7, 8. (TR.)

[3] *Thos. Moore*, l. c., chap. 8, p. 65.

Hosted by Google

controlling principle of his government was that Ireland was a conquered country, and as such her inhabitants held their possessions by no title other than the good-will of the king. A system of legalized robbery, under the specious name of an inquiry into the titles by which property was held, was begun and perfected by him, and under its operation the whole province of Connaught was declared the inheritance of the crown, and parceled out among the favorites of the court. This measure was the more atrocious, in that the king, by the contract of 1628 between himself and the landed proprietors of Ireland, had promised to make good by act of parliament the titles of the actual possessors of lands. In a parliament, which met in Dublin in 1634, many of whose members were selected either directly by the viceroy, or in compliance with his wishes, subsidies to the amount of £46,000 sterling were voted to the king; but when the question of confirming the promised Fifty-one Graces was raised, Strafford possessed sufficient influence to have the measure voted down. Among the leading causes that contributed to the success of this perfidious act were the threats and cajolery of the viceroy, the packing of the parliament, and the fact that of the Fifty-one Graces nearly all were intended to correct grievances that weighed upon *Catholics* alone.[1]

At the moment when the king was threatened by his Scotch subjects, and at variance with the English parliament, the Irish came generously forward to relieve his necessities, and in return asked only that he should do them the scanty justice which was now perfidiously denied them. But to do justice to Ireland was no part of the policy of the English government. The country was to be kept in a chronic state of rebellion for the benefit of thieves. "Rebellion," said *Leland*, a Protestant prebendary of Dublin, "is the goose that lays the golden eggs, and the lords chief-justices will not be stupid enough to kill it."[2]

Such was the policy of the officials who governed Ireland, or rather who, under pretense of governing that country, did

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. IX., pp. 336, 337. (TR.)

[2] Apud *Moore*, Bk. I., ch. 9, p. 73.

Hosted by Google

their best to aggravate the condition of the unfortunate inhabitants and keep them in a state of continuous revolt. It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that a formidable uprising of the people, under the lead of Roger O'Moore and Sir Phelim O'Neil, took place October 23, 1641. At first the insurrection consisted only of detached bands, organized for the purpose of surprising and getting possession of garrisons and strongholds, and acting without a complete understanding with each other; but in the following year it became general over the whole island, and a systematic and effective plan of operations was agreed upon. Following the example of the Scots, who had successfully maintained their right to freedom of worship, a number of leading men from every city, town, and county, including the Catholic nobility and the prelates of the kingdom, met in national convention at Kilkenny early in 1642, and forming themselves into a *Confederation*, bound themselves "by solemn oath never to sheathe their swords until they saw their religion free, their kingdom constitutionally independent, and they themselves in possession of their natural and inalienable rights."[1] In compliance with a request from the Confederation, the bishops and clergy of Ireland assembled in a *National Synod at Kilkenny*, May 10, 1642, and unanimously resolved "that, whereas, the Catholics of Ireland have taken up arms in defense of their religion, for the preservation of the king, . . . the security of their own lives, possessions, and liberty, we, on behalf of the Catholics, declare these proceedings to be most just and lawful. Nevertheless, if, in pursuit of these objects, any person or persons should be actuated by motives of avarice, malice, or revenge, we declare such person to be guilty of a grievous offense, and deservedly subject to the censures of the Church."[2]

The Synod ordained that there should be in each county and province a council composed of clerical and lay members, and a general or supreme council of similar composition, whose authority and jurisdiction the whole nation should

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 454. (TR.)

[2] *Ibid.*, l. c., p. 455. *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. X., pp. 100-101. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

recognize. These councils were primarily intended for the administration of the statute law, the authority of which was acknowledged, appeals being carried from the lower to the higher; but they also exercised executive functions.[1]

An oath was drawn up and administered to the members of the Confederation, binding those who took it to "bear true faith and allegiance" to King Charles; to defend their "prerogatives, estates, and rights;" to uphold "the fundamental laws of Ireland;" to maintain "the free exercise of the Roman Catholic faith and religion;" and to "obey and ratify all orders and decrees made, and to be made by the Supreme Council of the Confederate Catholics of this kingdom concerning the public cause."[2] It was further ordained that a *General Assembly* of the Confederate Catholics should be called. This body met *at Kilkenny*, October 24, 1642. Its members, although divided into two orders, the one consisting of the bishops and nobles, and the other of the representatives of the counties and towns, sat in the same chamber. The General Assembly, without taking the name, performed all the functions of a parliament, and announced that its business was "to consult of an order for their own affairs till his majesty's wisdom had settled the present troubles."[3] It nominated the members of the *Supreme Council*, and invested them with the authority of an executive government. They appointed sheriffs, coined money, carried on correspondence with foreign powers, had jurisdiction over civil officials and military officers, and were the ordinary representatives of national authority when the General Assembly was not convened, at the close of which they were changed. The General Assembly adopted as its motto the legend, "*Pro Deo, Rege, et Patria, Hiberni Unanimes.*" The success of the arms of the Confederation was a surprise, even to the most sanguine. Nearly every important city in Ireland, Dublin excepted, fell into their hands. And, when in the full tide of victory, their terms were moderate and their demands just.

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. X., pp. 101–102. (Tr.)

[2] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 59, note 2. (Tr.)

[3] *T. D. McGee*, Attempt to Establish the Reformation in Ireland, Boston, 1853, p. 111. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

The king appointed a Protestant nobleman, the Marquis of Ormond, to enter into negotiations with the Confederates. An armistice of twelve months, known as *The Cessation*, was agreed upon at Sigginstown, near Naas, on the 15th of September, 1643, by the terms of which both parties were to retain possession of places respectively occupied by each, and the Catholics to hold the churches and ecclesiastical property they had regained, and to be unmolested in the free exercise of their religion. In the following year the armistice was prolonged for twelve months more, and when this period was about to expire, Charles, finding his condition in England well nigh hopeless, and having absolute and immediate need of both the money and the soldiers of Ireland to uphold his tottering throne, gave Earl Glamorgan a secret and informal, though binding commission, to cross the channel and negotiate a peace with the Confederation. Arrived at Kilkenny, Glamorgan met the Supreme Council, and concluded a treaty (August 25, 1645), by which the Catholics were granted freedom of worship, permitted to take possession of all churches not actually in the hands of the clergy of the Established Church, and secured in the enjoyment of many valuable civil, political, and social rights.[1]

A copy of the treaty fell into the hands of the Puritans, and Charles, to escape the odium the discovery caused, sent an address to parliament, disavowing the articles. Earl Glamorgan was arrested by Ormond, who, professing to believe the commission a forgery, cast him into prison. Ormond now drew up another treaty of Thirty Articles, in which he artfully allowed the claims for which the laymen contended, and denied those on which the clergy insisted. This treaty was objected to by the clergy and the better class of the laity, and was disagreeable to the Papal Nuncio, *John Baptist Rinuccini*, who had lately arrived in Ireland. It was, nevertheless, confirmed by the Supreme Council at Kilkenny, on the 28th of March, 1646.[2] The great bulk of the Irish people were indig-

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., Vol. X., pp. 101–103. *Brenan*, l. c., pp. 455–456. (Tr.)

[2] While the treaty was signed on the above date, the documents were not exchanged till the 29th of July of the same year. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

nant, believing that the advantages they had purchased so dearly had been bartered away, and they did not hesitate to apply epithets of traitor and perjurer to the members of the Supreme Council.[1] This event caused a split among the members of the Confederation, and the old Irish Catholics and the clergy began to be depressed, when their hopes were suddenly revived by the news of a brilliant victory gained by their leader, Owen Roe O'Neil, the Irish Fabius, over the Scottish commander, Monro, at Benburb, June 5, 1646. With a force inferior to that of his enemy, O'Neil put him to an ignominious flight, captured his artillery, baggage, and provisions, and, while himself sustaining a loss of not above seventy men, left close upon three thousand of Monro's dead upon the field of battle.[2] On the 11th of June, O'Neil proclaimed war on the Supreme Council, and in the August following a National Synod convened at Waterford, which issued a declaration to the effect that "all and each of the Confederate Catholics who should adhere to the peace" of the Thirty Articles should be regarded as "perjurers," and that the assembled fathers would never consent to any treaty which did not guarantee unrestricted freedom of worship. By another decree, dated Kilkenny, October 5th of the same year, those adhering to the Peace were declared excommunicated and the Peace itself null and void, because it gave no satisfactory security for the free exercise of the Catholic religion.[3] This decree was virtually ratified by the General Assembly, which met at Kilkenny, January 7, 1647. In July of this year the Marquis of Ormond, conscious that the royal cause had become hopeless, surrendered Dublin to the Parliamentary army, and now having the undivided power of the enemy brought against them, and experiencing dissensions in their own ranks, the Confederates found it impossible to hold out, with any reasonable hope of success. The divisions among the Confederates were still further increased by a treaty of peace, entered into (May 20, 1648) between the Supreme Council and

[1] *Lingard*, l. c., p. 164 sq. Vindiciae Catholicorum Hiber. Auctore *Philopatre Irenaeo*, l. I., quoted by *Brenan*. (TR.)

[2] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 74. (TR.)

[3] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 459. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Lord Inchiquin, who had lately deserted the Puritan for the royal cause. The bishops protested in a declaration published at Kilkenny, but their protest proving ineffectual, on the following 27th of May they caused a document to be affixed to the gates of the cathedral of St. Canice, in Kilkenny, excommunicating all the theologians who had approved the Peace and the members of the Supreme Council who had given it their assent. The excessive use of the censures of the Church has, as at all times, worked evil, and the present instance is no exception. Heretofore the bishops, at least, had been practically a unit on every important question, carrying with them, by their harmony and uniform action, the whole body of the clergy and the better class of the laity. But now they split among themselves, some maintaining that the sentence of excommunication was valid; and others, their equals in learning and virtue, denying that, under the circumstances, there was any justification of the measure. In the meantime, Ormond returned to Ireland, and on the 17th of January, 1649, a treaty of peace, containing thirty-five articles, was ratified and published by the General Assembly at Kilkenny. This was the last official act of the Confederation. A few days later the king ended his life on the scaffold, and on the 15th of the following August, Cromwell landed in Ireland, and immediately commenced the subjugation of the country. After a short siege, he took Drogheda by storm, and even the Protestant Killen admits that thousands, including "priests, monks, citizens, and soldiers," were put to the sword. And the fate of Drogheda was the fate of every city and town that did not surrender at the first summons to the Puritan tyrant, who, holding the Bible in one hand, slaughtered innocent victims with the other. Limerick was taken in October, 1651, after a protracted siege, and Cromwell declared confiscated nearly all the lands belonging to Catholics in Ireland, and divided them among his soldiers and a class called "adventurers," who advanced money to pay the army. Twenty thousand were transported to the West Indies, and many thousands more, chiefly females, to the American colonies.

[1] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 119. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Those who were not sent abroad were shut up in the western province of Connaught. Preparations for the settlement of Connaught by the Catholics were completed by the year 1653, and, by an act of the English parliament, all who were found after the date of May 1, 1654, on the eastern side of the Shannon, were liable to the penalty of *death*. British settlements, extending to a distance of several miles, were planted along the sea-coast and the western bank of the Shannon, and composed of men long trained to military service. Judging by human standards, the Catholic religion was as good as extinct in Ireland. This barbarous proscription was applicable to all the land-owners of the island who could not prove that during the whole time of the civil war they had shown a "constant good affection to the cause of the parliament." It must also be borne in mind that Connaught had been made desolate by the civil wars, and that those of the nobility who could trace their ancestry back to the dim mists where history begins, and who had been accustomed to move about in noble palaces and enjoy all the luxuries of life, could not find a dwelling fit for a human being to abide in. Famine supervened to add to the miseries of war and persecution, and historians, Protestant and Catholic alike, agree in stating that no pen can adequately portray the hardships and sufferings which this poor but gallant people underwent for religion's sake. Of a hierarchy of twenty-six prelates, three only were permitted to remain;[1] and of the priests, those who were not martyred were commanded to go into exile, only twenty-eight days being given them to quit the kingdom.

Cromwell went to meet his judge September 3, 1658, and two years later *Charles II.* made his public entry into London. It is asserted that the new king had promised to deal justly with the Catholics of Ireland; but, if such promise had ever been made, it was soon forgotten. The Puritans, who were in possession of their lands, began now to represent them as fomenters of dissension, disturbers of the public peace, subjects of a foreign potentate, and incapable of loyalty

[1] *Darcy McGee*, l. c., p. 130. In the year 1653 there was only one bishop in the whole island. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 146. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

to the crown. It was the old strategy, and was received by the enemies of the Church with as much credulity in that age as it has been in our own. To correct these misrepresentations, a number of the Catholic leaders met in Dublin in 1661, and drew up a "*Remonstrance*," addressed to the king, in which they stated that they felt themselves "obliged, under pain of sin, to obey his majesty in all civil and temporal affairs, as much as any other of his majesty's subjects, and as the laws and rules of government in this kingdom did require at their hands."[1] The Roman Catholic nobility and gentry of Ireland, for the most part, were unanimous in their approval of the sentiments set forth in the Remonstrance; while the clergy, on the other hand, protested against it as containing sentiments disrespectful to the Holy See and propositions condemned by Popes Paul V. and Innocent X.[2]

It soon became evident that the Remonstrants received their inspiration from Ormond, the Lord Lieutenant, and that his aim was to divide the Catholic clergy and people among themselves. A synod was convened in Dublin, June 11, 1666, to consider the questions raised, and, six days later, unanimously rejected the Remonstrance. They, however, drew up another, in which, while omitting the passages disrespectful to the Holy See, they embodied the same expressions of loyalty as set forth in the one of 1661. This action gave great offense to Ormond, and, in consequence, the bishops who had

[1] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 142. (TR.)

[2] *Brenan*, l. c., pp. 478–480.

The passages to which exception was taken read as follows: "And that, notwithstanding any power or pretension of the Pope or the See of Rome, or any sentence or declaration of what kind or quality soever, given, or to be given, by the Pope, his predecessors or successors, or by any authority, spiritual or temporal, proceeding or derived from him or his See, against your majesty or royal authority, we will still acknowledge and perform, to the uttermost of our abilities, our loyalty and true allegiance to your majesty. And we openly disclaim and renounce all foreign power, be it either papal or princely, spiritual or temporal, inasmuch as it may seem able, or shall pretend, to free, discharge, or absolve us from this obligation, or give us leave or license to raise tumults, bear arms, or offer any violence to your majesty's person or royal authority, or to the State or Government." This was not the production of the Irish leaders, but an exact copy of the Declaration presented by the South Britons to Charles I. in 1640. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

come to Dublin again left the country. At the close of the year 1668, there were only two prelates in the island.[1] In the month of May of the year 1670, *Lord Berkeley* became viceroy, and during the four years of his administration the Catholics enjoyed a season of comparative exemption from persecution. Bishops returned; provincial and diocesan synods were held; Catholics occupied positions of public trust and honor; churches and chapels were again opened; and the old faith began once more to flourish in the land. But this interval of peace was only the stillness of the calm that precedes the storm. In 1673 the Puritans, who were in a majority in the house of commons, forced the king to recall Lord Berkeley, whose justice and humanity in the government of Ireland excited the indignation of these fierce zealots. The "Declaration of Indulgence to Dissenters," granted three years previously, was revoked, and the "Test Act" again enforced. Those refusing to take the oath of supremacy, to deny transubstantiation, and "to receive the Sacrament" according to the rite of the Established Church, were declared incapable of holding either civil or military office.[2] Catholics were forbidden to reside in corporate towns; bishops and others exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction by the Pope's authority were commanded to quit the kingdom; convents were dissolved, and all priests banished.[3] In 1677, Lord Essex, who had succeeded to Berkeley in the viceroyalty of Ireland, was recalled, and Ormond again appointed in his place. The news of the "*Popish Plot*" reached the viceroy in the course of the following year, and, while he ridiculed the clumsy invention in private, he made it a pretext in public for fresh persecutions against the Catholics. It was pretended that the "*Plot*" extended to Ireland; and although, as the Protestant *Killen* candidly avows, "the evidence against the accused possessed transparent marks of falsehood," *Peter Talbot*, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and *Lord Montgarret*, both far advanced in years, the latter being eighty-one, and both

[1] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 146. (Tr.)
[2] *McGee*, l. c., p. 143. (Tr.)
[3] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 150. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

sinking under disease and infirmity, were dragged to prison, where they ended their days.

Oliver Plunket, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, who, *Killen* tells us, "was an ecclesiastic of blameless morals and pacific temper," but who, "according to the testimony" of two friars and an apostate priest, whom he had punished for their vices, "was a most desperate revolutionist," was of so exalted a character that the fear of not being able to get even a Protestant jury to convict him in Ireland induced his persecutors to send him to London, where he was tried at Westminster, and sentenced to be hanged, emboweled, and quartered, "according to law." He was executed at Tyburn, July 1, 1681. Those who bore false witness against him all ended their days miserably.[1]

These persecutions continued until the accession of *James II.*, in 1685, when the Irish Catholics again looked forward in the hope of seeing them suspended and their rights restored. They were not disappointed. Lord Clarendon was sent as viceroy to Ireland in 1686, with instructions to grant freedom of worship to Catholics; to remove or disregard their civil disabilities; and to admit them equally with Protestants to offices of State. The reform of the army was intrusted to Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, and brother to the late Archbishop of Dublin. Protestant soldiers were removed, and Catholics appointed to fill their places. These changes alarmed the Protestants, and their fears were still further aroused by the information that Talbot had gone to England for the purpose of pressing the repeal of the Act of Settlement, and by his appointment to the government of Ireland in the room of Clarendon, in whose recall he had been chiefly instrumental. Affairs were in this condition when James, driven from his throne by William of Orange, passed over to France (1688). The disasters that overtook the king in England did not shake the loyalty of his Catholic subjects in Ireland. To them his cause was identical with their own. From the reign of Henry VIII. down, they had borne sufferings and death for their faith; he had granted

[1] See his life, by the *Rev. Dr. Croly*, of Maynooth, Dublin.

Hosted by Google

freedom of worship. They had labored under civil and political disqualifications; these he had removed. They had been robbed of their lands; he had shown an inclination to repeal the Acts of Settlement. These and other considerations attached them to James; but both their hopes and his were extinguished by the decisive battle of the *Boyne*, July 2, 1690. James quitted Ireland immediately after this disastrous and to him disgraceful engagement, but the Irish Catholics fought on for a year longer. Their defeat at the battle of *Aughrim*, July 12, 1691, which was followed on the 13th of the following month by the capitulation of *Limerick*, destroyed all possibility of successful resistance, and made the authority of William supreme over the whole island. By the Treaty of Limerick, it was expressly stipulated that Catholics should be obliged to take only the oath binding them "to bear faithful and true allegiance to their Majesties William and Mary;" and yet in the year following an oath was drawn up and presented for their acceptance, in which they were called upon to deny the dogma of "transubstantiation" in "the Lord's Supper;" and to declare that "the invocation of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as now used in the Church of Rome, are damnable and idolatrous." An "oath of abjuration" was also drawn up, which went on to say that no foreign prince or prelate "hath any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm."[1]

[1] *McGee*, l. c., p. 168. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 177 et seq.

During this and the preceding reigns, the clergymen of the Protestant Church in Ireland do not appear to have been self-denying, saintly men, or to have corrected in their own lives faults of which they complained so loudly in those of others. Speaking of the "Irish Episcopal Church," immediately after the Restoration, *Killen* says: "In the selection of the new dignitaries, political services and family connections had generally more influence than piety or learning. Instead of devoting themselves to the spiritual duties of their office, and thus seeking to remove the odium which had so long rested on their order, most of the *bishops* still continued to give offense by their covetousness, secularity, and ambition." One who subsequently became an archbishop was notorious "for his penuriousness and indolence." Another, who subsequently became Primate and Chancellor of Ireland, seems to have merited his promotion by his avaricious greed. He "was not satisfied with three sees," but, on "the

Hosted by Google

By the Treaty of Limerick, the Irish Catholics were secured in the enjoyment of "their goods and chattels," "their estates of freehold and inheritance," together with all their interests and immunities; and yet by an act of the Irish parliament of 1695, any one known to have sent his child to the Continent, to be brought up in the Catholic faith, was incapacitated from prosecuting suits at law, from receiving any legacy or deed of gift, and was condemned to "forfeit" all his goods and chattels and "all his hereditaments, rents, annuities, offices, and estates of freehold."[1] A Protestant heiress, who married a Catholic, was punished by loss of her inheritance.[2] In the parliament of 1697, an act was passed requiring all Catholic archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and all Catholics exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to quit the kingdom before the 1st of May, 1698, and should any return, they were declared subject to the penalties of high treason.[3] Between the years 1696 and 1699, over nine hundred priests were banished the kingdom, and the two or three hundred who remained were obliged to hide away in the caverns of the earth or the pestilential morasses of the open country.

The old scheme for robbing the Catholics by issuing a commission to inquire into defective titles was again revived, and under its operation 1,060,792 acres were forfeited to the crown, in addition to the 10,636,837 already seized.[4] At the

groundless plea that he could find no clergymen," appropriated for three years the "incomes" "of six parishes," leaving the Protestant parishioners in the interval "without a ministry." Neither did these holy men, who came to bring the pure light of the Gospel to a benighted and superstitious people, appear to improve as time went on. Mary, writing to William just after the battle of the Boyne, tells him to "take care of the Church in Ireland. Everybody agrees," she says, "that it is the worst in Christendom." We are told that Thomas Hacket, the Protestant Bishop of Down and Connor from 1672 to 1694, traded "in benefices with unblushing effrontery. The livings in his gift were sold to the highest bidder. For twenty years he was never within the bounds of his diocese, etc." And so the list of these good and pure Reformers goes on to the end of the chapter. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 130 and 182–183. (TR.)

[1] The 7th of William III., chap. IV., s. I. (TR.)

[2] *Ibid.*, s. I. (TR.)

[3] The 9th of William III., chap. I. (TR.)

[4] The proceeds from the confiscated lands were employed to defray the ex-

Hosted by Google

death of William, the Catholics, who only a century before had held in fee three-fourths of the soil of Ireland, did not now own above "one-sixth part" of that amount.[1]

The twelve years of Queen Anne's reign (1702–1714) form one of the darkest epochs of the history of persecution in Ireland. The enactments of the Irish parliament of 1703 can not be equalled in inhuman atrocity and a satanic disregard for the rights of mankind by the records of any legislative body that ever disgraced a civilized world. They are absolutely without a parallel. One of them, entitled "an act to prevent Popish priests from coming into the kingdom," declared guilty of high treason and subject to its penalties all who should "harbor, relieve, conceal, or entertain" Catholic priests; and "any mayor, justice of the peace, or other officer," who was proved to be negligent in enforcing the law, was liable to fine of one hundred pounds. Another, entitled "a bill to prevent the further growth of Popery," consisting of twenty-eight sections, which received the royal assent March 4, 1704, is the most elaborate digest of legislative persecution that was ever framed.[2]

---

penses of the war of 1688. A new class of adventurers were thus introduced into the country, consisting chiefly of Dutch and German Protestants. Their descendants in Munster are known to this day as "*Palatines.*" *McGee*, l. c., p. 170. (Tr.)

[1] *Bedford's* Compendious and Impartial View of the Law affecting the Roman Catholics, London, 1829, p. 15. (Tr.)

[2] The following is a summary of this bill, given by the Protestant historian, *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 194, 195: "It provides that any persuading a Protestant to embrace Popery, and every such pervert (!) shall incur the penalty of praemunire; that, if the eldest son of a Popish landlord conforms to the Established Church, the father shall hold the estate only as a tenant for life, whilst the son shall be proprietor in fee; that the orphan children of Popish parents shall be intrusted to Protestant guardians, and brought up in the Protestant religion; that any Papist undertaking such guardianship shall be liable to a penalty of five hundred pounds; that no Papist shall be at liberty to purchase lands for a longer term than thirty-one years; . . . that a Papist, who has inherited from a Protestant any estate, tenement, or hereditament in fee, and who does not conform to the Established Church, shall not be entitled to continue in the enjoyment of the property; that a Papist, who is the owner of a freehold, shall not have the power to bequeath it to his eldest son; that at his death it shall be split up in equal portions among all his male children; but that the law of primogeniture shall be maintained should the eldest son, within

Hosted by Google

By a third act of the parliament, every secular priest was obliged, under penalty of banishment, to come forward before the 24th of June, 1704, register his name, age, the place of his abode, the name of his parish, the date of his ordination, the bishop by whom he was ordained, and to give security that he would not pass beyond the borders of the county in which he resided. By another clause of the same act, any priest who might apostatize had the sum of twenty pounds a year settled on him.[1]

The aim of this enactment was obvious. Heretofore it had been difficult to apprehend or convict priests, but now it was only necessary, when occasion required, to send police to the designated places of abode, arrest, and execute the penalties of the law upon the poor victims, whose confessions in their written registrations were ample evidence against them. These laws were so revolting to the feelings of our common nature that great difficulty was experienced in putting them in execution. The offices of the public informer were required, and there is no character so contemptibly odious to Irish instincts and Irish honor. Hence it was necessary to give those performing such offices a diploma of good conduct, and it was accordingly declared "that the prosecuting and informing against Papists was an honorable service, and that all magistrates who neglected to execute these laws were betrayers of the liberties of the kingdom."[2]

It should seem that the laws against the Irish Catholics were now sufficiently severe to satisfy any human being not inspired by satanic hatred against the Church of Christ. But the *Earl of Wharton*, the viceroy, did not think so, and in a speech, which he delivered in the Irish parliament of 1709, he so wrought upon the fears and the bigotry of the members,

three months after his father's death, produce a certificate from the Protestant bishop of the diocese, stating that he belongs to the Church as established by law; that no Papist shall be capable of voting at an election for a member of parliament until he has taken the oath of allegiance and abjuration; and that all persons assembling at St. Patrick's Purgatory, Lough Derg, shall incur a fine of ten shillings each, and, in default of payment, receive a public whipping." (TR.)

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 549. *Killen*, l. c., pp. 195, 196. (TR.)

[2] *Irish Commons, Journal*, Vol. III., p. 319. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

if, indeed, they needed any such incentive, that they resolved that many "Popish bishops had lately come into the kingdom," who "had presumed to continue the succession of the Romish priesthood, and that their return was owing to a defect in the laws." They accordingly passed a new act "to prevent the further growth of Popery," providing that the children of Catholics, by conforming to the Protestant worship, might compel their parents, through the court of chancery, to make known the full amount of their property, and to provide the young apostates with a suitable maintenance; that no one should be regarded as a Protestant who had not taken the oath of abjuration and received the Sacrament after the form of the Established Church; and that any one informing on an archbishop, bishop, or vicar-general, should receive a reward of fifty pounds; for a regular the reward was twenty pounds, and for a school-master ten pounds; these sums to be levied off the Catholic inhabitants of the county in which the person informed on resided.[1] In 1710, those priests who had complied with the law of registration were commanded to come forward before the 25th of March, and take the oath of abjuration, under penalty of banishment, and, should they return to the country, they were declared guilty of high treason. Anne, the last and the worst of the contemptible Stuarts, died on the 1st of August, 1714, and the character of the penal code of her reign can not be better described than in the words of Edmund Burke. "It was," says this distinguished statesman, "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

On the accession of *George I.* of the house of Brunswick to the English throne, the Tories were driven from office. The king was not naturally intolerant, but this element, which had formed so conspicuous a part in the characters of the late rulers of England, was abundantly supplied by the persecuting spirit of the Whigs, who had lately come to power. In 1715,

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 550. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 203. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

the Scotch raised the standard of revolt in favor of the *Pretender;* and, while the Catholics took no part in the quarrel, they were as violently persecuted as if they had. Catholic nobles were hurried to prison; churches and chapels were closed throughout the kingdom; priests were seized at the altars, where they were officiating; and the usual bribes were offered to informers. The bulk of the execrable set of miscreants, known as *priest-catchers*, were Jews, who pretended to be converts to Catholicity, and assumed the dress and sometimes simulated the functions of priests.[1]

In 1719, the Presbyterian Dissenters obtained an Act of Toleration; but no corresponding concession was granted to the Roman Catholics. Under the pretext that the Catholics were at heart attached to the Pretender, and only awaited a favorable opportunity to give him their support, they were visited with additional penalties by the Irish parliaments of 1716 and 1723.[2]

About this time, secret agents from the French Jansenists were sent into Ireland, and books containing their errors were distributed over the country. Pope Clement XI., taking alarm at these efforts to undermine the faith of the Irish people, sent, through *Vicentius Santini*, his internuncio at Brussels, a warning to the Irish bishops, accompanied with a request that they would in some public way declare their acceptance of the bull "*Unigenitus.*" Each member of the Irish hierarchy sent in reply letters expressive of the attachment of themselves, their priests, and their people to the Holy See and its teachings; and assured the Holy Father that, though oppressed and despised, they would never cease to preserve with the Head of the Church "*unity of spirit in the bond of peace,*" and that no such evasive terms as "*religious silence and the question of right and fact*" had been adopted by them.

In the early part of the reign of *George II.* (1727–1760), a pretended fear of the influence of Catholics caused the passage of an act depriving them altogether of the privilege of voting

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 551, 552. (Tr.)

[2] The 2d of George I., chap. X. *Ibid.*, chap. XIX., s. 7. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

for members of parliament or the magistrates of "any city or corporate town;"[1] and, by another act of the same parliament, Roman Catholics were forbidden to practise as barristers or solicitors.[2] At the time of this enactment, very nearly all the members of distinction belonging to the legal profession in Ireland were Roman Catholics, and they yielded reluctantly to the command of the law obliging them either to give up their profession or prove apostates to their God. Under the circumstances, it is not wonderful that some of them professed Protestantism openly, while they were at heart loyal to the old faith. It was noticed that, when about to be admitted to the Bar, persons, who until then had practised the Catholic religion, and who were now base enough to stultify their consciences for a paltry gain, never made very zealous or even fair Protestants. Thus far they had been obliged to produce only a certificate, stating that they had received the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church, as by law established either in England or Ireland. But an act was now passed, requiring that any one demanding admission to the Bar should prove, on satisfactory evidence, given under oath, that he had been a Protestant during *the two previous years;* and, should he neglect to educate his children under fourteen years of age at the time of his admission, or those born to him after this date, he was condemned to forfeit his certificate.

In 1733, another act was passed, making this law still more stringent, and disqualifying any convert to Protestantism from practising in the courts of law who should allow his Roman Catholic wife to educate her children in the Catholic faith.[3]

In 1743, the rumor of an intended French invasion furnished another pretext for fresh persecutions, and so violent was the feeling against Catholics that one member of the privy council advocated an indiscriminate massacre of the whole body. A proclamation was published, which, in addition to the sums already set upon the heads of ecclesiastics, offered a reward

[1] The 1st of George II., chap. IX., s. 7. (Tr.)
[2] *Ibid.*, chap. XX. (Tr.)
[3] The 7th of George II., chaps. V. and VI. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

of one hundred and fifty pounds for the conviction of a bishop or archbishop; fifty pounds for a priest; and two hundred pounds for any one who might harbor or give protection to a bishop.[1]

Churches were again closed all over the country, and so vigilant and energetic were the officers of the law that it seemed impossible to escape them. Driven from their churches, the priests would gather the faithful about them on some green hillside or in a secluded nook of a pleasant valley, and there, on a rude altar of stone in the temple of nature, offer up the everlasting sacrifice to nature's God. Such are Ireland's witnesses to the faith.

During the long period of persecution from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of George II., the Irish Catholic bishops were continuously driven from their dioceses, and forced to seek an asylum in some country on the Continent. What was for so long a necessity, by repetition grew into a practice; and the continued and protracted absences of the chief pastors from their flocks was beginning to work so much harm that Pope Benedict XIV., in a beautiful letter, dated August 15, 1741, reminded them of their duty. He implored them, as he said, with tears in his eyes, to remedy the evil, and told them plainly that if the word of God was not preached, the Sacraments not administered, if morals were corrupted, and the people in ignorance and error, they, and they alone, were responsible.[2]

From this time forth the hardships of the Irish began to grow less galling and oppressive; still one more effort was made by James Hamilton, not only to revive all the inhuman legislation of the reign of Queen Anne, but to add other statutes, which, if less atrocious, were more cunningly devised and more maliciously wicked. In 1756 a bill was introduced by him in parliament, providing for the registration of all Catholic priests, and also requiring that only one priest should be allowed to each parish; that he should be appointed by the

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 561. (Tr.)

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 557 sq.; yet the date of Benedict XIV.'s letter is not August 1, 1746, given by *Brenan*, but August 15, 1741, as is proved by the *Bullar.*, ed. Venet. 1768, p. 29. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

grand jury, and sanctioned by the privy council and lord lieutenant; that he should give information of all priests residing in his parish; and that he should not attempt to make converts. Another clause provided for the expulsion from the country of all bishops, dignitaries, and friars. The bill, though defeated, was again introduced in the following year and passed, but the king refused to put his name to it, and from this act dates the definite mitigation of the penal laws in Ireland.[1]

The Duke of Bedford, who was appointed lord lieutenant in the autumn of 1757, signified that he would pursue a policy friendly to Ireland, and that the inhabitants might count upon his good services in redressing their grievances and satisfying their just demands. The Roman Catholic clergy of Dublin immediately expressed their acknowledgments in an *Exhortation* to the people, in which, after thanking the government for its "large charities" during a recent season of scarcity, they called upon the people to show their gratitude to their civil governors "by an humble, peaceable, and obedient behavior;" to live virtuously; to abstain from crimes and misdeeds of every sort; and "to avoid riots and tumults," and thus "prove themselves good citizens and pious Christians."[2]

The moment seemed opportune to take some definite steps toward ameliorating the political condition of the Catholics of Ireland, and accordingly an association was formed for this purpose. The members, who were exclusively of the commercial and citizen classes, the nobility and gentry having refused to join them, generally met at the Elephant Tavern, in Essex street. After the usual preliminaries, they gave aim and purpose to their labors by appointing the famous Dr. Curry, the hardly less famous Charles O'Conor, and Mr. Wyse, a Waterford merchant, a sort of executive committee for the association. The first work of the committee was to make a statement or declaration of principles, a task which they committed to *Dr. O'Keefe*, Bishop of Kildare. The document was chiefly confined to proving for the thousandth time that Cath-

[1] *Brenan*, l. c., pp. 562, 563. (TR.)
[2] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 275. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

olics may be good and loyal subjects, and that their Church teaches no doctrine incompatible with civil allegiance.

An opportunity of testing these principles soon came. When, in 1759, the French threatened a descent upon the coast of Ireland, the Roman Catholic committee sent an address to the lord lieutenant, in which they professed themselves "ready and willing, to the utmost of their abilities, to assist in supporting his majesty's government against all hostile attempts whatsoever."[1] The address was graciously received, and the speaker of the Irish house of commons, where it was read, expressed the extreme satisfaction which the evidence of the loyalty of the Roman Catholics afforded that body. On the accession of *George III.* (1760–1782) to the English throne, the committee prepared and forwarded to that monarch a congratulatory address, in which they reminded him that they were under certain disabilities, not imposed upon other citizens, and expressed the hope that they "might not be left incapable of promoting the general welfare and prosperity."[2] In 1767, public prayers were offered up, for the first time since the Revolution, in all the Catholic Churches of Ireland for the sovereign and the royal family. Concessions, however, came slowly and grudgingly. By an act of the Irish parliament of 1774, the only oath to be required of Irish Roman Catholics was one expressive of allegiance to the house of Hanover, and denying that the Pope of Rome "had or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm."[3]

The tone and form of address used heretofore toward Catholics in official documents began now to be more respectful. When they had not been hostilely termed "the common enemy," they had been contemptuously styled "Papists;" but in an act of parliament of the year 1778, by which their condition was greatly improved, they were designated "Roman

[1] Charles O'Conor is the reputed author of the address. See *Mitchell's* Hist. of Ireland, p. 80. (Tr.)

[2] *Plowden* I., Appendix, p. 276. (Tr.)

[3] *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 296. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Catholics."[1] Among the supporters of this act was the celebrated Henry Grattan, a name ever dear to the Irish people.

The fear inspired in England by the breaking out of the war of American Independence had probably more to do with the concessions now granted to Irish Catholics than any fair-minded purpose of doing them justice. The privilege granted by the parliament of 1771 of obtaining a lease of sixty-one years on land reclaimed from unwholesome bogs, and situated at least a mile from any town, and the permission given by the parliament of 1774 of taking an oath of allegiance, which did not contain a direct denial of the Catholic faith, can not be regarded as either very gracious or very generous concessions. Neither can the act, passed in 1778, permitting Roman Catholics to take leases for 999 years; making the conditions of the sale and inheritance of their lands the same as those enjoyed by Protestants; declaring them capable of holding and using any estates that might be conveyed or devised to them; relieving parents of the burden of supporting a wayward or wicked child, who might go over to the Established Church; and abolishing the law providing for the reversion of a Catholic father's estate to his eldest son, should the latter give up the Catholic faith, be considered as more than satisfying the demands of strict justice, and indicating on the part of some a growing disposition to be fair. For it is well to remember that this act did not pass the Irish house of commons until after a protracted and severe struggle. The same may be said of every concession that followed. As years went on, the rigors of the penal laws were gradually relaxed. In 1782, an unsuccessful effort was made to repeal the law passed in 1745, declaring invalid marriages celebrated by Catholic priests between Catholics and Protestants. But in the same year the right of Catholics to purchase lands in perpetuity, to teach schools attended by children of their own faith, and to act as guardians to Roman Catholic children, was recognized.[2] Priests were also permitted to celebrate Mass publicly, provided the building in which they celebrated had neither a steeple nor a bell, a prohibition which was evaded by suspending a bell from a neighboring tree.[3] Other disabilities were removed by the Relief Act of 1792,[4] and a petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, presented to George III., January 2, 1793, by a delegation sent to London for the purpose, was followed in the same year by a second Act of Relief, which was passed through both houses of the Irish parliament more in obedience to the will of the government than from inclination on the part of those who gave it their support. By this act the Catholics were exempted from attending the service of the Established Church on Sundays; declared qualified to hold all offices and places of trust and profit under the crown, whether military or civil, except those of lord lieutenant, lord deputy, and lord chancellor, and seats in parliament; and admitted to the elective franchise,[5] of which, as Mr. Burke remarked, there were very few to take ad-

[1] This act is the 17th and 18th of George III., chap. XIX. (TR.)

[2] The 21st and 22d of George III., chaps. XXIV. and LXII.

[3] *Coyan*, i. 144. (TR.)

[4] The 32d of George III., chap. XXI. (TR.)

[5] The 33d of George III., chap. XXI. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

vantage, "because almost all the old freeholders had been worn out during the reign of the penalties." [1]

We have seen that when Catholic seats of learning in Ireland were closed, and the most rigid laws existed against opening Catholic schools of any sort, Irish priests and Irish gentlemen passed over to the Continent, and by their zeal for religion and their love of the sciences and arts, which had been banished from their own land, so interested strangers in their behalf, that seminaries and colleges were established in almost every country of the whole of Europe, through whose hospitable doors the exiled Irish student entered in pursuit of the learning which a nation, boasting of its enlightenment, denied him in his own home and in the land of his fathers. The Annals of the Four Masters were arranged at one of these colleges, and McGeoghehan's History of Ireland written at another. O'Connell studied at St. Omer's, and Luke Wadding and Dr. Doyle at Cambrai. All the men distinguished in Irish Catholic history for nearly three-quarters of a century previously to the date of the Relief Act were educated on the Continent.[2]

Dr. O'Keefe, Bishop of Kildare († 1787), has the honor of having founded *Carlow College*, the first Catholic college in Ireland since the Reformation. It was not opened for the reception of students until the year 1793.[3]

The closing of the Irish colleges in France by the breaking out of the Revolution, and their declining condition in other countries, caused the Irish hierarchy to cast about for some means of training their seminarists at home. It was thought necessary, under the circumstances, to modify somewhat the original purpose of Carlow College, and to admit to its halls students training for the priesthood. But this provision was inadequate. In February, 1794, the Irish hierarchy presented an address to the Lord Lieutenant, in which they state that the education given at the University of Dublin, while it is excellent for the purposes for which it was designed, is by no means suited to ecclesiastics, who require a special training of their own; and they therefore beg that his excellency may be pleased to recommend to his majesty the policy of establishing and endowing a college for the education of aspirants to the priesthood. The petition was favorably received, and in 1795 an act was passed establishing a *college at Maynooth*, and an endowment of eight thousand pounds for the current yearly expenses was granted.[4]

To say that from the breaking out of the Reformation until

[1] *Correspondence*, Vol. III., pp. 363, 364, London, 1844. (Tr.)

[2] Besides the colleges already mentioned at page 243, there were those of St. Anthony (1617), the Collegium Pastorale Hibernorum (1624), and the Irish Dominican College (1659) at Louvain. At Rome, Fr. L. Wadding, assisted by the Barberini family, founded (1625) the Irish Franciscan College of St. Isidore, and he also persuaded Cardinal Ludovisi, "Protector of Ireland," to found (1628) an Irish secular college, which was under the direction of the Jesuits, and of which Oliver Plunket was a student.

[3] *Brenan*, l. c., p. 567. (Tr.)

[4] This sum was increased in 1806 to thirteen thousand pounds, but again reduced in 1808 to the original grant. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

the French Revolution "there was no law for Catholics in Ireland," [1] is to state a sad but stern truth. It was only too manifest that in the interval those in power had no wish to do justice to Ireland, and no interest in making its inhabitants peaceable and contented citizens. The atrocities which preceded and caused the rebellion of 1798 abundantly prove this statement.[2] That the acts of injustice perpetrated by England upon Ireland were real and weighty national grievances is shown by the fact that Protestants, as well as Catholics, participated in the rebellion. The people were driven to desperation, and the principles of the French Revolution, which were diffused among them chiefly through the works of the infidel, Thomas Paine, hastened the uprising. The Catholic hierarchy and clergy, as a body, exerted all their power and influence to quell the popular passions. The bill for the *Union of Ireland with England*, which received the royal assent on the 1st of August, 1800, and went into effect on the 1st of January, 1801, was the sad result of this rebellion. By this bill the existence of Ireland as a distinct nation came to an end.

If the penal laws had been executed with the rigor contemplated by their framers and enactors, the preservation of the Catholic religion in Ireland would have been, judging by human standards, a verification of the words of Our Lord, speaking of His Church, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against thee."

§ 332. *Protestantism in France.*

Histoire ecclésiastique des Églises réformées au royaume de France (par *Th. de Bèze*), Anvers, 1580, 3 vols. (to 1563). *Maimbourg*, Hist. du Calvinisme, etc. Hist. of the League, from the French, by *Dryden*, Lond. 1684, 8vo. *Serrani* (Reformed Preacher of Geneva, † 1598), Commentarius de statu relig. et reipub. in regno Galliae, Gen. 1572 sq., 5 vols. *Thuanus*, Hist. sui temp. *Berthier*, Hist. de l'église Gall., Paris, 1749, 4to. **Lacretelle*, Hist. de France pendant les guerres de religion, Paris, 1814–1816, 4 vols. *Peignot*, Livre des singularités, Dijon, 1841. †*Capefigue*, Hist. de la réforme, de la ligue et du règne de Henri IV., Paris, 1834, 4 vols. †* *France and the Reformation* (The Catholic, 1842, April, May, and June numbers). † *Boost*, Hist. of the Reformation in

[1] *Moore*, Bk. II., ch. 11, p. 277.

[2] *Ibid.*, Bk. II., ch. 12, notes 90, 91.

Hosted by Google

France (1547–1844), Augsburg, 1844. *Schmidt*, Hist. of France, Hamburg, 1835 sq., Vols. 2d and 3d. *Ranke*, Civil Wars and Monarchy in France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Stuttg. 1852 sq., 5 vols.; London, 1852 (Complete Works, Vols. 8–13); as far as this, Vols. 1st and 2d. *Soldan*, Hist. of Protestantism in France until the death of Charles IX., Lps. 1855, 2 vols. *Polenz*, Hist. of French Calvinism until 1789, Gotha, 1857–1864, 4 vols. *E. Smedley*, Hist. of the Ref. in France, New York, 3 vols., 12mo. *Ch. Weiss*, Hist. of the Prot. Ref. in France, Lond. 1854, 2 vols., 12mo., and with an Append. by *H. W. Herbert*, New York, 1854, 2 vols., 12mo. *G. de Felice*, Hist. of the Protestants in France, from the Fr., Lond. 1853, 2 vols., 8vo.

Many circumstances contributed to pave the way for the introduction of the Reformation into France, among the most important of which were the influence exercised by the sects in the southern provinces; the excessive cultivation of polite literature; the active part taken by the University of Paris in the reformatory synods of Constance and Basle, which was in many ways more hurtful than beneficial, and led eventually to the promulgation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; the loose administration of the ecclesiastical law, according to the spirit of the so-called Gallican Liberties; the arbitrary methods of *Francis I.* (1515–1547) in conducting ecclesiastical, no less than civil affairs; and, finally, the appointment of bishops, who were more disposed to be servile to the king than obedient to the Pope. Both *Zwinglius* and Calvin had dedicated their most important works to Francis, and Luther and Melanchthon found eager readers in France. Among their most ardent admirers was the famous Biblical scholar, *Lefebvre d'Étaples*, so called from the town of Étaples, near Boulogne-sur-Mer.

The first Protestant community in France was brought together amid tumult and disorder at *Meaux* by *William Farel* and *John Leclerc*, a wool-dresser. Notwithstanding that the Sorbonne, whose tendencies were well known to be toward liberalism, had ordered the works of Luther to be burnt, they were industriously sought after and eagerly read. The Reformers had powerful patrons at court, and among them *Berquin*, the counsellor of state; the Duchess *d'Étampes*, the king's mistress; and *Margaret of Valois*, the king's sister. Margaret having married Henry d'Albert, King of Navarre, her court became the resort and refuge of Protestants fleeing from

Hosted by Google

persecution. On the other hand, Catholicism found able and zealous advocates and defenders in Cardinal *Duprat*, Chancellor to Francis I.; Cardinal *de Tournon;* and the queen mother, Louise of Savoy.

When the Protestants, emboldened by their growing numbers and relying on the protection of their patrons, recklessly demolished a figure of Our Lord and another of the Blessed Virgin, and had the hardihood to affix to the door of the king's palace an indecent writing against Transubstantiation,[1] *Francis I.* took alarm, and, apprehensive that the evils that had afflicted Germany might come upon his own kingdom, proceeded to take prompt and vigorous measures to check the propagation of Protestantism in France. Many of the Protestants, when pursued, sought safety in flight, and of those who were arrested some were put to death. Among the fugitives was *Calvin*, who withdrew to Geneva, whence he had his teachings carried into France. But, by a strange inconsistency, while Francis was persecuting Protestants in his own kingdom, he was doing his best to protect and encourage them in Germany; and, by following the same policy, his successor, *Henry II.* (1547–1559), got possession of the territories belonging to the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun.[2] This prince published ordinances of unusual severity against the Calvinists, notably the Edict of *Chateaubriand*, in 1551,[3] by which the inquisitorial jurisdiction over heretics, heretofore lodged in ecclesiastical tribunals, was transferred to the *secular* courts, because the former might not pass sentence of death upon those brought to trial before them. It was unfortunate that in France, as elsewhere, a much needed *reform among the clergy* had neither been introduced early enough, nor, when introduced, had it been carried out with sufficient promptitude and thoroughness. The instructions of the Provincial Council of *Narbonne* (December 10–20, 1551) were disregarded by the suffragan bishops, and the reformatory decrees of *Poissy* (1565) met with no efficient response from

[1] Apud *Gerdesius*, Hist. Evangelii renovati, T. VI., p. 50.

[2] See p. 138.

[3] *Barthold*, Germany and the Hugenots, Bremen, 1848, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

prelates, who were more intent on enjoying their wealth than on looking after the interests of the Church. The inconsistency of the policy of the government was favorable to the cause and growth of Protestantism, and accordingly Protestant communities were formed in the cities of *Paris*, *Orleans*, *Rouen*, and *Angers*. At a General Synod, held in *Paris* in 1559, these different communities united themselves into one body; adopted a *Calvinistic Confession of Faith* and a *Presbyterian form of Church government*; and, as if sanctioning in advance a law which would soon operate against themselves, *decreed that all heretics should be put to death.*[1]

During the minority of *Francis II.* (1559–1560) and *Charles IX.* (1560–1574), and the regency of the queen mother, *Catharine de Medici*, and while the *Dukes of Guise* and the *Princes of Bourbon*, the former supported by the Catholics, and the latter by the Calvinists, were contending for supremacy, the "*Hugenots*,"[2] as the French Protestants were now called, grew daily in numbers and influence.

Destitute of true piety, Catharine was foolishly *superstitious*; and loving *intrigue* rather than a straightforward course, she did not scruple to sacrifice the interests of her children to her own faithless policy. Protestant and Catholic were all one to her, and she coquetted with each as her interests or the exigencies of the moment demanded.[3]

That the Bourbons had espoused the cause of the Calvin-

[1] Cf. *Berthier, S. J.*, Histoire de l'Église Gallicane (commencée par *Longueval;* by Berthier, les six derniers volumes), Paris, 1749, 4to., Vol. XVIII., p. 460 sq. *Bordes*, prêtre de l'oratoire, supplément au traité de *Thomassin* historique et dogmatique, etc., pour établir et maintenir l'unité de l'église catholique, Paris, 1703, 2 vols., 4to.

[2] For various explanations of the meaning of this word, see *Daniel*, Hist. de France, ed. *Griffet*, 10–54. The derivation which makes "*Hugenots*" equivalent to *Eignots* or *Eidgenossen*, that is, those bound together by an oath, is beyond doubt incorrect. Its probable and more usual derivation is from the French provincial word *Hugo* or *Hugonot*, meaning *ghost of the night*, according to a popular tradition, which states that Hugo Capet goes about as a spirit, wandering up and down the streets. It was first applied to French Protestants in derision, because they usually held their meetings after night had set in. *Cluet* (Hist. de Verdun et du pays Verdunois) derives it from the word "*Goths.*"

[3] Cfr. *Von Reumont*, Catharine de' Medici in Her Youth, Berlin, 1854. *Alberi*, The Life of Catharine de' Medici.

Hosted by Google

ists for no reason other than to secure a powerful ally in their struggle against the Dukes of Guise and the house of Valois was very evident. *Louis of Condé*, the youngest of three brothers, became a most zealous advocate of the new teachings; while *Coligny* subsequently proved himself the ablest leader on the Protestant side. Catharine at first took sides with the Dukes of Guise, the most determined enemies of the Hugenots; and, by the marriage of Francis II. to Mary Stuart, threw the weight of her influence against the Bourbons.

The Calvinists, acting upon the advice of their theologians, headed by Beza, formed a conspiracy, known as the Conspiracy of *Amboise* (1560), against Francis II. and the Guises, which, however, was discovered in time to prevent its execution. Its authors were arrested, tried, and put to death.

It had been suggested that the establishment of the Inquisition in France would be an efficient means of preventing the growth of Protestantism; but this was forbidden by the Edict of *Romorantin* (1560); and, at the request of Admiral *Coligny*, the king, at the assembly of *Fontainebleau* (1560), had an enactment passed staying all legal proceedings against the Hugenots on *religious* grounds. He also promised to convoke a national synod for the special purpose of doing away with ecclesiastical abuses. The royal condescension was taken as confession of weakness, and gratitude for royal favors was expressed in the form of a conspiracy, at the head of which was the Prince of *Condé*. Catharine de' Medici pardoned the prince, and, in compliance with the wishes of Admiral Coligny, arranged for a theological conference at *Poissy* (1561), in presence of the court and assembled bishops. The Catholic party was represented by the *Cardinal of Lorraine*, a member of the house of Guise; by the eminent theologian, *Claude d'Espence;* and by the Jesuit *Lainez;* and the Protestant party by *Beza* and *Peter Martyr Vermili.* The controversy was spirited, and at times intemperate, particularly when the question of the Eucharist came up for discussion; but, like all such conferences, settled nothing.[1]

[1] See the Confessio Gallica, presented to Charles IX. in 1561, in *Augusti*, Corpus librorum symbolicor., pp. 110–125.

Hosted by Google

When the Guises entered into an alliance with Anthony, King of Navarre, and the Constable de *Montmorency*, the *astute* Catharine formed a counter-alliance with the Prince of Condé. As a consequence of this step, the Hugenots, by an edict of the year 1562, secured freedom of worship and the right to hold meetings openly anywhere, except in the principal cities of the kingdom,[1] upon condition that they should use no violence toward Catholics. The edict was ill received by the inhabitants of Paris and the Catholic population generally, who were justly incensed by the sanguinary atrocities perpetrated by the Hugenots. The parliament for a long time refused to register it, and did so finally only under protest.

The Calvinists, growing daily more bold and daring, began to murder priests and monks; forcibly compelled wayfarers to come in and listen to the sermons of their preachers, justifying their conduct by a decree of the Consistory of *Castres;* and, acting upon enactments of a synod of sixty-two ministers, convoked at *Nimes* in February, 1562, by *Viret*, interfered with the freedom of Catholic worship by creating disturbances in Catholic churches, and sometimes demolishing the edifices. These outrages roused the indignation of the Catholics, and the pent-up wrath of both parties burst forth, as if by mechanical impulse, leaving as witnesses of its presence all *the extravagant horrors of a civil and religious war.*[2] A trifling event gave the signal for the beginning of the conflict. Some noblemen, belonging to the suite of the Duke of Guise, got into a quarrel with a number of Hugenots, who had assembled for religious service in a barn at *Vassy*, in Champagne, and were disturbing, by their singing of psalms, the Mass, which was being celebrated in a neighboring church. The duke hearing the uproar, hastened to the spot to restore order. While endeavoring to do so, he was wounded by the blow of a stone, and his followers, infuriated by the indignity put upon him, rushed upon the Hugenots, killed sixty of their

[1] *Benoît* (Hist. de l'édit de Nantes, Delft, 1639 sq., 5 vols., 4to), Vol. I., Recueil d'édits, p. 1 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Lacretelle*, Hist. de France pendant les guerres de religion, Paris 1814–1816, 4 vols. (transl. into German by *Kiesewetter*, Lps. 1815 sq., 2 vols.) *Herrmann*, The Civil and Religious Wars of France in the sixteenth century, Lps. 1828.

Hosted by Google

number, and dispersed the rest (March 1, 1562). By Protestant writers this event is called the "Massacre of Vassy." The Calvinists, after many abortive attempts, had succeeded in establishing a community at *Toulouse*, but the peculiar elements of which it was composed gave rise to a suspicion that its object was more military than religious. This suspicion was confirmed when they made an effort to get possession of the city by a *coup de main;* but in this they failed, and the Catholics, after an obstinate and hard-fought contest, lasting from the 11th to the 17th of May (1562), came off victorious. Refusing to accept the proffered terms of capitulation, the Calvinists attempted to make their escape under cover of the darkness of the night, and falling in with the cavalry of *Savignac*, who had had two brothers killed in the battle of Toulouse, suffered the loss of many of their number. The loss of the Catholics was also severe.[1] The Calvinists complained loudly that the affair of Vassy and that of Toulouse were violations of the Edict of 1562; and the Prince of Condé, acting upon the advice of *Throckmorton*, the English embassador, put himself at their head, and began hostilities. While marching on Paris, at the head of an army of German Lutherans, Condé, together with several of the Protestant leaders, were made prisoners at the battle of *Dreux*, fought December 19, 1562, the issue of which was doubtful. Antoine de Bourbon, King of Navarre, a convert to Catholicity, died of a wound received at the siege of Rouen in the same year. Francis, Duke of Guise, now lieutenant of the kingdom, was assassinated (February 5, 1563) during the siege of Orleans, by *Poltrot de Méré*, a Calvinist in religion, a nobleman by birth, a craven by instinct, and a coward by nature. These events led to the edict of *Amboise* (March 19, 1563), by which freedom of conscience and the privilege of holding public service, under certain restrictions, were granted to the Calvinists. But the reconciliation between the two parties was more apparent than real, and of only short duration. The attempt of Coligny and Condé to get possession of the king's

[1] The insurrection of Toulouse (May 11–17, 1562), in "*The Catholic*" of Mentz, 1863, new series, Vol. IX., pp. 227–248, and 317–336.

Hosted by Google

person, by making themselves masters of the castle of *Monceaux*, in Brie, was the occasion of the breaking out of a *second civil war* in the year 1567, during which the bloody atrocities of the Hugenots, known as the "*Michelade of Nîmes*," were perpetrated. At the battle of St. Denys the Catholics gained a splendid victory, though they had to mourn the loss of the gallant Montmorency, Constable of France. In 1568, the Hugenots, through the kind offices of the Elector of the Palatinate, succeeded in negotiating a peace, and having the edict of 1562, without the clauses subsequently added, again enforced. This peace was regarded by the Hugenots only as a pretext to gain time to make preparations for carrying on the war with renewed vigor and energy. And in matter of fact, no sooner had they received from Elizabeth, Queen of England, and from the government of the Netherlands, the money necessary to carry on a campaign, than they at once began *the third civil war* (1568), which, for deeds of blood and acts of retaliation on both sides, surpassed either of the preceding wars.

Briguemont, the most distinguished of the Hugenot leaders, run the ears of assassinated priests upon a cord, and wore them as an ornament about his neck.

After the fall of the Prince of Condé, at the battle of *Jarnac*, in 1569, *Gaspar Coligny* placed himself at the head of the Calvinists, and extorted from the timid court the peace of *Saint-Germain-en-Laye*. This treaty, which was signed August 15, 1570, granted the Reformers freedom of public worship in two cities of each province; removed their political disabilities, thereby permitting them to hold any office of public trust; and, as a security for the future, put them in possession of the four fortified towns of *La Rochelle*, *Montauban*, *Cognac*, and *La Charité*. They had now been successful in obtaining official recognition as a religious organization.

But treaties could not efface from the minds of Catholics the horrible atrocities committed by the Hugenots, or stifle in their hearts the promptings of revenge. They brooded in silence over the wrongs they had suffered, and in secret they plotted to avenge them. In the hope of maintaining peace, Charles IX. invited Coligny to his court, and took him into

Hosted by Google

his counsels. Taking advantage of his position, the admiral used his influence to estrange Charles from his mother, and, by persuading him to support the rebels in the Netherlands, involved France in a war with Spain. At length a fortuitous event gave occasion for carrying into effect the long-cherished desire of revenge. The marriage of Henry of Navarre (Henry IV.) to Margaret, the youngest sister of Charles IX., attracted a great number of distinguished Calvinists to Paris, and on the *night of St. Bartholomew* (August 24, 1572), a name of terrible memory, they were set upon and massacred, thus again rekindling the lurid flames of civil war. This horrid massacre, however, was not the outcome of *a long and carefully prepared design.* On the contrary, as Protestant historians admit, it was the result of sudden impulse and hasty action, and was, in its origin, the work of the queen mother, who was apprehensive of the consequences which might follow an abortive attempt to assassinate Admiral Coligny two days previously, and known to have been inspired by her. The king was prevailed upon by Catharine de' Medici and her youngest son, the Duke of Anjou, and their most intimate friends, to give his consent to the assassination of Admiral Coligny, whom they represented as conspiring to stir up civil war, and they moreover hinted that he had designs upon the king's life. They urged him to immediate action, representing that if he should wait until the next morning, his mother, his brothers, and his most faithful servants would fall victims to the vengeance of the Calvinists. Charles was at first startled by so barbarous a suggestion, and for a long time was undecided how to act, but finally gave his consent.

The Duke of Guise, burning to avenge the death of his father, took upon himself the task of murdering Admiral Coligny. Rumors had been afloat during the day of a Calvinistic conspiracy to murder the Catholics, and the inhabitants of Paris, apprehensive of danger, were awake in momentary expectation of an attack, when the bell of the church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois sounded the alarm. This proved to be the signal for the execution of the Hugenots. The work of destruction spread with a rapidity characteristic of the city of Paris. Citizens and soldiers made a rush for the

Hosted by Google

dwellings of the Hugenots, who were shot down, sabered, and pitched into the Seine. The example of the city was imitated in the provinces; but while in the former the murders were sanctioned by royal authority, in the latter they were the effect of popular indignation and a desire of revenge. The number of those who, both in the city and beyond its walls, fell victims to this terrible crime was close upon four thousand. Charles at first endeavored to shift the responsibility from himself to the Guises, but on the 26th of August he spoke out plainly in parliament, saying that the deed had been done by his express orders, to head off a conspiracy of the Hugenots against himself, the royal house, the King of Navarre, and the noblest subjects of his kingdom. Such was the account that reached Rome, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who had gone there to attend a conclave, acting on this information, asked permission of Pope *Gregory XIII.* to make a solemn act of thanksgiving (*Te Deum*) to God for the preservation of the king's life.[1] On this occasion *Muret* gave a discourse, for which he has been frequently and severely censured, but which, because few who talk or write about it are at the pains to read it, has been grossly misrepresented.[2]

[1] Abbé *Darras*, Ch. H., Vol. IV., p. 230. (Tr.)

[2] The objectionable paragraph runs as follows: Veriti non sunt adversus illius regis caput ac salutem conjurare, a quo post tot atrocia facinora non modo veniam consecuti erant, sed etiam benigne et amanter excepti. Qua conjuratione sub id ipsum tempus, quod patrando sceleri dicatum ac constitutum erat, divinitus detecta atque patefacta, conversum est in illorum sceleratorum ac foedifragorum capita id, quod ipsi in regem et in totam prope domum ac stirpem regiam machinabantur. O noctem illam memorabilem—quae paucorum seditiosorum interitu regem a praesenti caedis periculo, regnum a perpetua civilium bellorum formidine liberavit. Mureti oratio XXII., p. 177, opp. ed. Ruhnkenii. As regards the number of those killed, which varies in different authors from ten to one hundred thousand, it may be remarked that la Popelinière, a writer unquestionably beyond all suspicion of dishonesty, speaks of but one thousand as having been massacred in Paris, and adds that in other cities the number was quite small. Desirous of fixing upon their opponents the stain of so infamous a deed, writers are apt to forget that Protestants had previously slaughtered a far greater number of Catholics. Marshal Montgomery, for instance, had three thousand Catholics butchered at *Orthez*. It is also a well established fact that from two to three hundred monks were either murdered or pitched into wells; that others were buried alive; and, finally, that as many as fifty cathedrals and five hundred Catholic churches of less importance were demol-

Hosted by Google

These congratulations are of precisely the same character as the felicitations addressed by European sovereigns to one of their royal cousins upon his escape and preservation from some direful calamity; and being consonant with usage among princes, need excite no surprise, much less the affected horror with which dishonest and sentimental writers are accustomed to speak of them. When the facts became fully and definitely known to the Supreme Pontiff, he left no doubt, either when speaking or writing, of the horror with which the infamous crime inspired him. The magnanimous *John Hennuyer, Bishop of Lisieux*, disregarding the commands of the king, took the Hugenots of his diocese under his special protection, and, as a reward for his Christian conduct, had the joy of seeing nearly the whole of them return to the Catholic Church. The court party had hoped that the result of their perfidy and crime would be to weaken the party of the Hugenots, but in this they experienced a bitter disappointment. With an energy that was akin to despair, and a ferocious thirst for revenge, the sectaries rallied for another struggle, and began in 1573 *the fourth religious war*. Destitute of an army adequate to take the field against the Hugenots, who had now allied themselves with the formidable *political* party lately organized at Milhau, in the Rouergue, Charles was forced to grant them another edict of pacification. The king died May 30, 1574, leaving to his brother, *Henry III.*, the last representative of the house of Valois, who resigned the crown of Poland to accept that of France, a weakened scepter and a divided kingdom. The condition of affairs required a man of energy and decision of character, and the new king possessed neither; and, in consequence, he was compelled to grant (1576) to the victorious Hugenots a peace incomparably more favorable than any they had yet obtained,

ished. Cf. *Audin*, Hist. de la St. Barthélemy, Paris, 1826. †* *Wm. von Schütz*, St. Bartholomew's Night Cleared up, Lps. 1845. *Soldan*, France and St. Bartholomew's Night. (*Raumer*, Pocket-Book of History, 1854.) *Freiburg Cyclopaed.*, art. "The Night of St. Bartholomew," Vol. II., p. 48. (French trans., art. "Barthélemy (St.)," Vol. II., p. 335.) *Gandy*, Origin, Character, Progress, and Consequences of the Night of St. Bartholomew (Revue des questions historiques, A. D. 1866).

Hosted by Google

which secured to them the free exercise of their religion in every part of the kingdom, except the city of Paris; a complete equality with the Catholics in civil and political rights; and an equal number of representatives in the parliament. Conditions so advantageous gave much offense to Catholics, who, for the purpose of successfully opposing the Calvinists, now formed themselves into a *League*, at the head of which Henry III., when the States assembled at *Blois* (1577), thought it prudent to place himself. Violations of the last treaty of pacification by the Hugenots gave occasion to a fresh war, the result of which was the edict of *Poitiers* (1577), which materially restricted the concessions granted in the last treaty.

As Henry III. was childless, and as his brother, the Duke of Alençon, had lately died, the two aspirants to the throne were the King of Navarre and the young Prince of Condé, both of whom were Calvinistic leaders. Dreading the consequences of having a Calvinist become King of France, the Catholics were anxious to bestow the crown on the *Cardinal de Bourbon*, the *Catholic* nearest of kin to the king. The proposal met with the approval of the cardinal, who, in 1585, published the manifesto of Péronne, with a view of furthering his interests. By misrepresentation and a dishonest concealment of facts, Pope *Gregory XIII.* was induced to give his consent to this arrangement. To hasten its consummation, a League was formed, extending to every part of the kingdom. When the Pope had been accurately informed of the dishonest purposes of the Leaguers, he withdrew his former approval; and his successor, *Sixtus V.*, while condemning them as dangerous conspirators, declared that, according to the fundamental laws of the realm, both Henry of Navarre and the Prince of Condé were incapable of ruling over France. Henry of Navarre appealed from the decision of the Pope to that of parliament, which had already declined to publish the pontifical bull. The affair was submitted to the arbitration of arms. Henry of Navarre was victorious at the battle of *Coutras* in 1587. After the assassination of the Duke of Guise, and the execution of the cardinal, his brother, both of which deeds had been done by order of Henry III., the League again became formidable. So violent were the denun-

Hosted by Google

ciations of the Sorbonne of Paris against the king that he was forced into an alliance with Henry of Navarre. He was shortly after assassinated (August 2, 1589) by *James Clement*; and, despite the papal bull, *Henry IV.* of Navarre succeeded to the throne.

Pope Clement VIII. consented to recognize his title on condition that he would embrace the Catholic faith.[1] Persuaded that he could successfully rule the country only as a Catholic, and acting upon the advice of *Sully*, his minister and personal friend, and at the same time consulting his own interest, he concluded that "France was worth the offering of a Mass,"[2] and accordingly professed himself a Catholic July 25, 1593. Two years later, the Pope proposed to remove from him the sentence of excommunication that had been passed upon him, provided he in turn would promise to become the protector of the Catholic Church, and to publish, with some omissions, the decrees of the Council of Trent. The nation had now begun to regard the League with disfavor, and its dissolution was completed by the attitude of the Roman Pontiff.

The spirit of the Calvinists, however, was still unbroken. They were as seditious as ever, and had lost none of their uncompromising independence. Notwithstanding Henry's firmness of character, they succeeded in extorting from him, in 1598, the *Edict of Nantes*, by which they obtained the free exercise of their religion *in every part of the kingdom;* were made eligible to the Parliament of Paris; authorized to form separate chambers in the Parliaments of Grenoble and Bordeaux; permitted to hold synods; and empowered to found universities at *Saumur*, *Montauban*, *Montpellier*, and *Sedan*. These concessions were at once so ample and so unusual that it required all the tact and resolution of the king to have the edict registered. Moreover, the hostility of the Catholics was quick-

[1] There is still extant in the archives of Prince Doria an unpublished autograph correspondence between *Henry IV.* and *Clement VIII.*, which is necessarily of the highest importance to a thorough understanding of the religious condition of Europe immediately after the return of the King of France to the Catholic Church. Cf. also *Staehelin*, The Conversion of King Henry IV. to the Catholic Church, Basle, 1856.

[2] *Journal des Debats*, September, 1871.

Hosted by Google

ened and intensified by the persistent intolerance of the Calvinists, who, in the thirty-first article of the Confession of the Synod of *Gap* (1603), made the following declaration: "We believe that the Pope is truly Antichrist and the son of perdition, spoken of in Holy Writ as the whore clad in scarlet raiment."

The assassination of Henry IV., on the 14th of May, 1610, by *Francis Ravaillac*, may be traced to the rancorous and implacable enmities existing between the two parties.

Mary de' Medici was declared regent during the non-age of Louis XIII. (1610–1643), and, while she held the reigns of government, the Hugenots enjoyed a season of comparative quiet. Under Cardinal *Richelieu* (1624–1642), however, whose rare intellectual endowments were supplemented by unusual energy of action, their condition underwent a complete change. Believing that no lasting peace could be hoped for from a body of men who were constantly showing signs of discontent, and assuming attitudes of defiance, and who were highly exasperated because the young king had married a Spanish princess, and the churches of Béarn, which had been taken from the Catholics, had been again restored to them, the cardinal made a radical change in the legislation regarding the Calvinists. *La Rochelle* was their last stronghold, and its capture was at once the death-blow to their party as a political organization (1628), and put a period to a bloody *strife*, which had lasted for *seventy-one years*.[1] Hence they made no attempt to disturb the peace during the minority of Louis XIV.; and when, in 1659, acting upon the suggestion of the Synod of *Montpazier*,[2] they offered to ally themselves with England, the plot was discovered, and its authors severely punished.

The sees of France were at this time filled *by men of ability and learning*, through whose exertions, admirably seconded

[1] *Fénelon*, Correspondance diplomatique, the last volume of which was published under the editorial supervision of *Cooper*, Paris, 1841. It contains valuable information on the battles of *Jarnac* and *Moncontour* (Dep. Vienne), the *Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, and the siege of La Rochelle.

[2] Not Montpellier, as is said in the French translation. Montpazier is the chief town of a canton in the department de la Dordogne, so named from a northern tributary of the river Garonne, with which united it forms la Gironde. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

by a body of priests, *trained in the schools of St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul*, and distinguished by the purity of their lives and the warmth of their zeal, great numbers of the Calvinists were by degrees brought back to the Church.[1] Thousands were also converted by the publication, in 1668, with the papal approbation of *Bossuet's "Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique."* The freedom of those who chose to continue heretics was being constantly abridged, until finally Louis XIV., having reached the superlative of absolutism, which he tersely expressed by the well-known phrase, *"I am the State"* (*L'état c'est moi*), and believing that the opposition and obstinacy of the Hugenots proceeded from political, rather than religious motives, acted upon the advice of *le Tellier*, his chancellor, and revoked the *Edict of Nantes*, October 18, 1685, substituting in its place another of twelve articles,[2] by which nearly all their privileges were withdrawn, and they themselves subjected to many hardships. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes, while it can not be said to have been wholly arbitrary, was a very inopportune and unwise measure. It is true it received the cordial approbation of many bishops of France, but it is equally true that it drove the Calvinists to desperation. They had also other causes of complaint. *Louvois*, the minister of state, by sending among them *missionaries, attended by dragoons* (*Dragonnades, la mission bottée, or, les conversions par logemens*), to work their conversion, had highly exasperated them. In consequence, sixty-seven thousand of them went immediately into *voluntary exile*, taking up

[1] *Picot*, Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France pendant le XVIIe siècle, Paris, 1824, 2 vols.; Louvain, 1824. German transl., by *Raes* and *Weis*.

[2] On the legality of this measure, *Hugo Grotius* (Apol. Riveti discuss., p. 22) says: "Norint illi, qui Reformatorum sibi imponunt vocabulum, non esse illa *foedera*, sed regum edicta ob publicam facta utilitatem, et revocabilia, si aliud regibus publica utilitas suaserit." Conf. (*Benoist*) Hist. de l'édit. de Nantes, Delft, 1693–1695, 5 vols., 4to. (*Ancillon*) L'irrévocabilité de l'édit. de Nantes, prouvée par les principes de la politique, Amsterdam, 1688. It is unnecessary to call attention to the numerous instances in which Protestants persecuted *Catholics* with incomparably greater severity; but it is a little remarkable that authors, who profess to write fairly and dispassionately, while employing all their eloquence to excite sympathy for the former, can not check their prejudices sufficiently to treat the latter with ordinary courtesy.

Hosted by Google

their abodes in England, Holland, and Denmark, but chiefly in Brandenburg. It is worthy of mention that Pope *Innocent XI.* disapproved of these severe measures, but not being himself on amicable terms with the French king, requested James II. of England to interpose his good offices in behalf of the oppressed Protestants.[1]

§ 333. *Protestantism in the Netherlands.*

Stradae Romani, S. J., Hist. Belgicae duae decades, Romae, 1640–1647, 2 vols., fol. and frequently. *H. Leo*, Twelve Books of Netherlandish History, Halle, 1835, Pt. II. The *same*, Manual of Univ. Hist., Vol. III. *Prescott*, Hist. of the Reign of Philip II., King of Spain, London, 1857. †* *Koch*, The Revolt and Defection of the Netherlands from Spain, Lps. 1860. †* *Holzwarth*, The Defection of the Netherlands, Schaffhausen, 1865–1871 (Vol. I. from 1539–1566; Vol. II., in two parts, fr. 1566–1572, and fr. 1572–1581 resp., 1584). *Nuyens*, Hist. of the Netherlandish Rebellion, 1865–1870, in 4 vols. Conf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 193 sq., 269 sq. *J. L. Motley*, The Rise of the Dutch Republic, 1856, tr. into Germ. (Dresden, 1857), Dutch and French. By the *same*, Hist. of the United Netherlands, of which two vols. appeared in 1860.

There was no country of Europe more exposed than the Netherlands to the twofold infection of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies. To this condition of things many causes contributed. The inhabitants were the unwilling subjects of Charles V.; they kept up an active commercial intercourse with Germany; and their minds had been long distracted, and were now unsettled by the quarrels of literary men and the controversies of the Schoolmen. These circumstances were fully appreciated by Charles V., and, fearing their consequences, he ordered the Edict of Worms against Luther to be published in the Netherlands; had the Inquisition introduced; and, by the execution of *Henry Voes* and *John Esch* (1523), gave the people to understand that he was terribly in earnest in what he was doing. Here the emperor put aside the gentle forbearance which he exercised toward the Protestants of Germany, and, by a display of unusual severity, sought to avert from his own patrimonial dominions the

[1] Such is the testimony of *Macaulay*. See *Döllinger*, The Church and the Churches, etc., Preface, p. XXXIII.

Hosted by Google

disasters, such as the Peasants' War, which the Reformation had brought upon that country. But, in spite of this rigor, Holland soon became the scene of the fanatical excesses and barbarous cruelties of the *Anabaptists*. A Dutch *translation of the Bible*, made in the spirit of the principles of Luther, by *James van Liesveld*, was published in 1525. Charles saw that still more rigorous measures were necessary, and he accordingly issued decrees of greater severity against the heretics in 1530 and 1550.

When *Philip II.* (from 1556) succeeded to his father, his zeal to preserve the purity of the Catholic faith led him to employ measures still more severe and despotic against these unfortunate people, thereby violating rights that had been secured to them by the most solemn pledges. The Flemings, who were already discontented at seeing the more important offices of State filled by the Spaniards, were still further incensed when Philip II., by the authority of a bull obtained from Pope Paul IV., bearing the date of May 14, 1559, in place of the four old sees of *Utrecht*, *Arras*, *Cambrai*, and *Tournay*, established fourteen new ones, and raised *Malines*, *Cambrai*, and *Utrecht* to the dignity of archbishoprics. These States had been intrusted by Philip to the government of Charles V.'s natural daughter, *Margaret*, *Duchess of Parma*, with Cardinal *Granvelle* as prime minister. The cardinal, who was a man of indefatigable industry, and possessed great capacity for business, sided with the Flemings in their opposition to the increase in the number of episcopal sees;[1] but his devotion to the Head of the Church, and his loyalty to the king, rendered him an object of aversion to the malcontents, and furnished them a pretext for revolt. Their hatred of him culminated when the Council of Regency was called to consider the question of publishing the Decrees of the Council of Trent in the Netherlands. The cardinal favored, the Calvinists steadily opposed the publication. They organized against him. At their head were *William*, *Prince of Orange*, Stadtholder of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht; *Count*

[1] Documents inédits, papiers d'état du Cardinal de Granvelle, Paris, 1841–1842, 3 vols., 4to.

Hosted by Google

d'Egmont, Stadtholder of Flanders and Artois; and *Count de Hoorne*, High Admiral of the United Provinces. They formed a league, and so threatening was their attitude that Margaret was forced to beg that the obnoxious minister be recalled (1564). The powerful Triumvirs now resumed their places in the Council of State, whence they had withdrawn, but they did not possess sufficient influence in that body to prevent a vote favoring the publication of the Tridentine Decrees. When the result of the vote reached Philip, he ordered all the edicts against heretics to be enforced with the extremest rigor. The order furnished a fresh and plausible pretext for opposition on the part of the malcontents, who were under the skillful direction of William "*The Silent*," Prince of Orange. He was a son-in-law of Coligny's, and, from motives of ambition, devotedly attached to the cause of the Hugenots.

On the 16th of February, 1565, a dozen noblemen, wholly under his influence, signed a compact, known as "*The Compromise of Breda*," by which they demanded a redress of grievances. In a few months the number of signers had increased to two thousand,[1] of whom two hundred were Catholics. Their arms and their services they placed at the command of William. This "*Compromise*" the Triumvirs designedly abstained from signing. Meetings were held throughout the whole of the Netherlands, and in the following month of April a deputation of two hundred and fifty gentlemen sent through Margaret a petition to Philip, demanding the suppression of the Inquisition and a revocation or suspension of the severe edict of religion with which they were threatened.

Balaimont, one of the nobles of Margaret's court, contemptuously styled the members of the deputation "*Gueux*," or Beggars, a name which they afterward appropriated as one of honorable distinction. Notwithstanding that the petitioners professed their intention of maintaining the Catholic Church, and that alone, a Protestant *Symbol* appeared in the Netherlands in the year 1561 (*Confessio Belgica*), and was adopted by many of the Belgians, who worshiped apart by

[1] *Freiburg Cyclop.*, Vol. VII., p. 602. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

themselves and followed a rite of their own.[1] Receiving encouragement from the magistrates and nobles, the Protestants rose simultaneously over the whole country, and Calvinists, who had sought an asylum in France, returned in large bodies. Conscious of their power, they began to inflict upon others the treatment of which they had but lately so bitterly complained. Even in the larger cities, they entered, sacked, and pulled down churches and convents; destroyed images and pictures; and so blind was their rage that the magnificent cathedral of Antwerp did not escape its fury. In the meantime, the regent, after the recall of the obnoxious *Cardinal Granvelle*, succeeded in concluding a treaty with Louis of Orange and twelve noblemen, which was in a measure satisfactory to the Reformers. By this instrument their grievances were corrected, and the severity of the ordinances in force against them mitigated. These concessions, however, did not prevent them from rising in rebellion, and submitting their cause to the fortune of a doubtful war, in which they were completely vanquished.

William of Orange was forced to quit the country, and seek an asylum in Germany; and Count d'Egmont, deserting the Protestant cause, threw himself upon the mercy of the king (1567). The royal authority was restored in the revolted provinces, and the Catholic religion was again triumphant.

Philip should have been content with matters as they now stood; but, instead of being so, he adopted an unwise and aggressive policy. Withdrawing the government from the gentle and prudent Margaret, he transferred it to the stern, but by no means tyrannical, *Duke of Alva*,[2] whom he appointed

[1] *Augusti*, Corpus libror. symbolicor., pp. 170–177.

[2] The American, *Wm. H. Prescott*, in his History of the Reign of Philip the Second, King of Spain, Boston, ed. of 1855, Vol. II., p. 298, says of him: "Far from being moved by personal considerations, no power could turn him from that narrow path which he professed to regard as the path of duty." And, as a proof that Alva was not wholly insensible to feelings of compassion, when they did not interfere with the performance of his duty, Prescott refers to a letter of his to the king, written in behalf of the afflicted family of Count d'Egmont. The duke says: "Your majesty will understand the regret I feel at seeing these poor lords (Egmont and Hoorne) brought to such an end, and myself obliged to bring them to it. But I have not shrunk from doing what is

Hosted by Google

generalissimo, and sent into the Netherlands at the head of ten thousand picked men. Alva made his entry into Brussels on the 22d of August, 1567, and began the work of his office by appointing a "*Council of Troubles*," consisting of twelve persons, whose duty it was to hunt up the authors of the late troubles and bring them to summary punishment. Many of the nobility, who had taken part in the revolt, fled from the country. Of those who remained, eighteen were executed on the 1st of June, 1568; and, on the 5th of the same month, Count d'Egmont and Count de Hoorne died the death of conspirators at Brussels. The property of the leaders of the conspiracy was confiscated. William of Orange, whose estates had thus escheated to the crown, now began to levy war with troops raised in Germany and France, and, aided by his brother, Louis of Nassau, meditated a simultaneous attack upon the Spaniards in Friesland, Guelderland, and Brabant. This design was frustrated by Alva. Louis having been defeated at Gemmingen, near the Ems (July 21, 1568), hastened to join his brother with the remnants of his forces, and the two now endeavored to effect a junction with Condé, who was at the head of the French Calvinists. Alva, who divined their plans, intercepted them, and forced them, after many defeats, to retreat into Germany. Thus far Alva had discharged the important duties of his office with ability and success. But the *new scheme for raising money*, by exacting, besides other imposts, one-tenth of the value of goods every time they changed hands, which he now introduced, again fanned into a flame the embers of a protracted and momentous civil war.

The Dutch merchants turned toward William of Orange for protection, and contributed liberally to enable him to con-

for your majesty's service. . . . The Countess Egmont's condition fills me with the greatest pity, burdened as she is with a family of eleven children, none old enough to take care of themselves; and she too a lady of so distinguished a rank, sister of the Count Palatine, and of so virtuous, truly Catholic, and exemplary life. There is no man in the country who does not grieve for her! I can not but commend her," he concludes, "as I do now, very humbly, to the good grace of your majesty, beseeching you to call to mind that if the count, her husband, came to trouble at the close of his days, *he formerly rendered great service to the State.*"

Hosted by Google

tinue a struggle, which they hoped would deliver them from the tyranny of the Spanish yoke. The injudicious measure of Alva, so detrimental to the commercial interests of the Netherlands, gave a decided and triumphant victory to the Reformers, which, under other circumstances, they could never have obtained in that country.

William at once changed his whole plan of operations. Transferring the war from land to water, he issued letters of marque to privateers, which swept the sea in search of Spanish vessels. The northern provinces rose in insurrection, and so critical did Alva's position become that he sent in his resignation to his government, and was recalled in the autumn of 1573. He was replaced by *Don Luis de Requesens y Zuñiga*, a man of ability and moderation. He revoked the odious financial edicts, and was just beginning to give fair promise of a prosperous and successful career, when, unfortunately for the interests of Spain in the Netherlands, he died prematurely in 1576. His successor in the government was the illustrious hero of Lepanto, *Don John of Austria*, Philip's half-brother. Lacking the skill of a statesman, and the sternnesss of a disciplinarian, he proved wholly unfit for his new position. The northern and southern provinces rose in revolt, and, by their combined efforts, expelled the Spanish soldiers who plundered their country and the commander who tolerated their excesses (1576). This enabled the Prince of Orange to include five more provinces in the confederacy that had been formed, "as a defense against any violence that might be practiced in the name, or to promote the interests, of the king." Don John of Austria was declared an enemy of the State, and his successor, *Archduke Matthias of Austria*, being no match in diplomacy for the astute William, was wholly deceived as to the import of the oath which that wily statesman prevailed upon him to take (1578), and was in consequence obliged to be content with a merely nominal authority. War again broke out. *Don Alessandro da Farnese*, now in command of the royal forces, gained a splendid victory at Gemblours (January 31, 1578), thus preserving the southern provinces to the king and the Catholic cause. The northern

Hosted by Google

provinces were in the hands of William of Orange, who, though he had given pledges to respect the rights of Catholics, failed to make them good in a single instance.

The *Treaty of Union* between the *seven northern provinces* was signed at *Utrecht* in 1579, by which it was agreed that the Confederated Provinces should form an indissoluble union, and that questions of war and peace and the levying of taxes should be submitted to a vote of the representatives of the Confederacy. William of Orange was appointed stadtholder, high admiral, and generalissimo of all the forces, whether on land or sea, and was to hold these offices for life. Heretofore the provinces in revolt had headed all their public documents with the name of the king; but they now left off doing so, and substituted instead that of William of Orange.[1] In 1568 William had declared that "he had taken up arms to secure religious freedom to the Catholics, no less than to the Evangelicals," and that it was his intention "to see that the former should be in the full enjoyment of their rights." He, however, forgot or proved false to his promise, and in 1582 published an ordinance, which was rigorously enforced, proscribing the Catholic religion in Holland. William was assassinated in the year 1584, but his loss did not shake the courage of his followers. They called to the head of the government his second son, *Maurice*, who, with the aid of troops sent over by Queen Elizabeth, maintained himself during the interval from 1588 to 1590, and took the offensive in 1591, after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and the year following, when the royal troops were under the command of the successor to Don Alessandro, who had lately died. By the armistice of 1609, the northern provinces were recognized as a *Republic*, but their independence was not definitively acknowledged by Spain until the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

The close alliance of these confederated provinces with France and England was favorable to the spread of Calvinism, whose principles were indorsed by the synods of *Dordrecht* in 1574 and 1618, and defended and developed by the University of *Leyden*. The Catholics in Holland, however,

[1] *Freiburg Cyclop.*, art. "Netherlands." (TR.)

Hosted by Google

were still very numerous, and the southern provinces of Belgium remained steadily loyal to the Church.

OBSERVATION.—"In *Italy* and *Spain*," says *Guericke*, "the darkness of Popery shut out the pure light of the Gospel." *McCrie*, an English writer, speaks of the *generous* sympathy with which Protestantism was received in these countries; but it may be truthfully said of his statements, that they belong to the domain of fiction rather than that of fact.[1] There is no proof to the contrary furnished by the Italian work entitled "*On the Charity of Christ*," published in 1542.[2] *Padre Saluzzo, O. S. F.*, was mainly instrumental in preventing the spread of Protestantism in Upper Italy.

§ 334. *General Causes of the Rapid Spread of Protestantism.*

†* *Marx*, Causes of the Rapid Propagation of the Reformation, etc., Mentz, 1834. *Moehler's* Ch. Hist., Vol. III., pp. 159 sq.

It is perhaps no more than natural that Protestant writers should manifest a certain bias when treating of this subject; but it is certainly a little strange to find authors of name comparing the rapid spread of Protestantism to the progress made by Christianity when it was first preached to man, without taking into account the very different circumstances which accompanied the propagation of both the one and the other.

It should be borne in mind, on the one hand, that the early Christian confessors were reviled and persecuted as no set of men ever were; and, on the other, that favors the most flattering and privileges the most ample were the portion of the Reformers.

To escape the charge of partiality, we shall confine ourselves to facts from which a judgment may be fairly formed.

1. Luther's efforts received a color of recognition and support from the serious complaints which had been made in

[1] *Thos. McCrie*, Hist. of the Rise and Fall of the Reformation in Italy (Germ. by *Friedrich*, Lps. 1829). By the *same*, Hist. of the Development and Suppression of the Reformation in Spain (Germ. by *Plieninger*, Stuttg. 1835). *Adolfo de Castro*, Hist. of the Spanish Protestants and their Persecution by Philip II. (tr. fr. the Spanish into German, and edited by *Hertz*, Frankfort, 1866). *Franzisca Hernandez* and Fray Franzisco Ortiz, or Beginnings of Reformatory Movements in Spain during the reign of Emperor Charles V., by *E. Boehmer*, Lps. 1865.

[2] Germ transl., Lps. 1855. Cf. *A. Theiner*, Della introduzione del Protestantismo in Italia tentata, Roma e Napoli, 1850.

Hosted by Google

general councils, with a view to the correction of existing abuses. Many well-meaning bishops had spoken out in no faltering terms against abuses of every kind, and chiefly against those of indulgences; and hence, when Luther re-echoed their language, he was listened to with approval. Moreover, at the outset of his career, he professed to teach only the pure doctrine of the Catholic Church, and to desire only the correction of abuses and the enforcement of discipline; and his professions being honorable and apparently sincere, carried with them a weight of authority to which they were by no means entitled. In this way, for the time being, he imposed upon a great number of persons, not among the illiterate alone, but among the learned also; and such men as Cochlaeus, Willibald Pirkheimer, Zasius, Wizel, John Haner, Erasmus, and others of equal distinction in the literary world were among his dupes.

2. Luther and his followers employed every means, fair and unfair, to misrepresent the teaching of the Catholic Church, and to put forward their own as the pure and genuine teaching of the Gospel. They did not hesitate, when addressing the illiterate, to tell them that the Mass was an impious act of worship and the veneration of Saints an *idolatrous one.* The Calvinistic Confession of Faith proclaimed "that pure and divine truth is banished from the Church of Rome; that her Sacraments are corrupted and falsified; *and that she tolerates in her bosom every sort of impiety and superstition.*"[1] And having adopted these unscrupulous methods, Luther went on to speak and write with such an air of assurance that it was next to impossible that any doubt as to the truth of his assertions should enter into the minds of those who had once received what he said with implicit trust.[2] Papal tyranny was an inspiring theme for eloquent and lively sermons, offensive satires, and abusive libels; and the beauties of evangelical liberty were spoken of in words so fulsome and glowing that people began to fancy that these incontinent preachers were really messengers of glad tidings to man.

[1] The French Calvinistic Confession of Faith repeats the same untruth.

[2] *C. A. Menzel,* l. c., Vol. I., p. 84.

Hosted by Google

3. That the spirited and popular writings of Luther, Zwingli, and others of the Reformers, while based upon erroneous principles, contained *many truths*,[1] many passages full of beauty, and many arguments that commended themselves to the reason, can not be denied; neither can it be denied that the writings of Melanchthon, Calvin, and Beza possessed a grace, a limpidity, and a classic purity of style, which of themselves, and independently of the subject-matter, gave a pleasing and fascinating charm to the compositions of these authors. Another secret of the influence of Luther and his followers was their zeal in instructing the people and their solicitude in training children; and the favor with which the catechisms published by Luther were received prompted Catholics to give more attention to the serious and sacred duty which they were intended to accomplish. Again, the people were delighted at hearing the Divine Service recited in their own tongue, and gratified at being permitted to partake of the Chalice, for which they had desired so long and so ardently. These concessions produced an impression so deep and enduring that, while it was obscured as time went on, it was never wholly effaced.

4. By placing in the hands of the people a new edition of the Bible, and making every one his own interpreter of its contents, Luther flattered the vanity of the masses and secured their allegiance and good-will. He was never tired telling them that to interpret Scripture was their privilege equally with the clergy. "Every Christian," said he, "has unquestionably a right to teach;[2] and if the clergy have heretofore arrogated to themselves the sole right of reading the Scriptures, it is only because they foresaw that if it were the privilege of all, the office of the priesthood would cease to exist, and the people become in all things their equals." In the doctrine of Luther concerning *slave-will* and *justification by faith alone*, the people found a convenient remedy for sin, and an easy means of restoring peace to their troubled consciences. The confessing of one's sins and the obligation of fasting are duties irksome to human nature, and they were glad to be rid of them.

[1] See above, p. 64.

[2] 1 Peter, II. 9.

Hosted by Google

Finally, the charm of novelty, which has at all times and under every condition so many fascinations for the popular mind, was not without its influence in propagating the teachings of the Reformers. That religious motives had little to do with the conversion of the bulk of those who passed over to Lutheranism is abundantly shown by the profligacy of their lives, which were so shameless that even Luther himself confessed that nothing comparable to such a state of morality ever existed under the Papacy. "The devil," said he, "having been driven out of them, has returned again with seven others, and their last condition is worse than the first." [1]

5. Luther also displayed considerable skill in turning the quarrel between the Humanists and Schoolmen to his own advantage; and as at the outset of his career he had profited by the outspoken protests of many well-meaning bishops against the abuses of indulgences, so at a later period he managed to draw to his side a number of Humanists deceived by his specious professions. The *printing-press*, too, which had just commenced the work it has kept up ever since with *such ceaseless activity*, was employed by him to spread far and wide, with a rapidity never before known to the world, the knowledge of his undertaking, and more or less detailed accounts of his labors.

6. *By declaring celibacy and monastic vows abolished*, Luther gained over many ecclesiastics, to whom these restraints and obligations had become irksome. Having once broken their solemn promises to God, these unworthy churchmen were prevented by love of sensual indulgence and fear of punishment from ever again returning to the Church.

7. *Self-interest*, on the part of those who embraced Protestantism, goes a long way in accounting for its success. "The bold attacks made upon time-honored authority, and the appeals to individual reason and private judgment in matters of religion, were soon found to be equally applicable to affairs in the temporal order. If the commands of the Pope were spurned, why should the advice of the parish priest be listened to? If the Reformers treated crowned heads with contempt,

[1] See above, p. 127 sq.

Hosted by Google

how could the people be expected to continue long obedient subjects? If the peasant might form his own judgment of the things of God, might he not with equal justice define his rights as to the chase and pasturage? If the monk was no longer bound by vows, which he had *voluntarily* spoken, why should the peasant be a slave to obligations to which he had never given his consent, and which he believed to be contrary to the will of Christ?"[1]

The people, however, were not put to the trouble of drawing these inferences; Luther did it for them in his two works, "*On the Liberty of the Children of God*" and "*On the Temporal Power;*" and that they were quick in getting at his meaning and energetic in turning his teaching to practical account, the history of the "*Peasants' War*" abundantly proves. "These people," said Melanchthon, in a tone of complaint, "growing daily more accustomed to liberty, now that they have shaken off the yoke of the bishops, will accept no other. What do they care for doctrine or religion? Their thoughts are fixed only on liberty and power."

8. "By a singular coincidence," says *Schiller*,[2] "*two political facts* contributed to bring about the schism. On the one hand, the sudden preponderance of the house of Austria, which menaced the liberties of Europe, and caused princes to fly to arms; and, on the other, the ardent zeal of this house for the maintenance of the old faith drove nations into revolt." Princes were all the more willing to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered them, in that they hoped to derive from it many advantages. First of all, they desired to free themselves from the suzerainty of the emperor; next, Luther had commanded them *to seize and confiscate the estates of churches and convents;* and, lastly, they were allowed by his system to take the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction into their own hands. Against the cupidity which he thus excited in their breasts, he was himself obliged, some time later, to protest. "There are still," he says in one of his sermons, "some

[1] *Raumer*, Hist. of Europe from the End of the Fifteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 380.

[2] Hist. of the Thirty Years' War, Bk. I., in initio.

Hosted by Google

truly good evangelical princes;" and he adds the reason, "because there are yet remonstrances in Catholic churches which they can steal and monastic estates which they can confiscate." In his "Table Talk" he consigns to the custody of his satanic majesty those princes who appropriated to their own use the goods they had stolen from the Church, while ministers of the Gospel, with wives and children on their hands, had not enough to keep them from starving. Unless aid be sent, and that speedily, he said, it will be all up with the Gospel and the schools in this country, for the pastors are destitute.

9. When princes had gained so many advantages by the Reformation, it was but natural that *they should employ all the resources at their command to have it introduced everywhere.* On this point the proofs are so evident that *Jurieu*, an inveterate enemy of the Catholic Church, makes the following candid avowal: "That the Reformation was brought about by political power," he says, "is incontestable. Thus in Geneva, it was the Senate; in other parts of Switzerland, the Grand Council of each canton; in Holland, the States-General; in Denmark, Sweden, England, and Scotland, kings and parliaments, that introduced it. Nor was the supreme power of the State content with guaranteeing full liberty to the partisans of the Reformation; it also took from Papists their churches, and forbade them *to exercise their religion in public.* Nay, more, in some countries the private exercise of Catholic worship was forbidden by legislative enactments." "In Silesia," says *Adolphus Menzel*,[1] "the new church was mainly established

[1] L. c., Vol. II., p. 2; Vol. III., p. 91 sq. If it be said that Catholic governments also persecuted and put to death some of those who first professed and propagated the new teachings, it may be fairly replied that there is a wide distinction between the two cases. Catholic rulers desired to protect the *ancient religion, which had been maintained for a thousand years, and was so essentially a part of the laws and constitutions of their States* that they regarded an assault upon it as a menace to the social and political orders to which it had given life and form. (See above, p. 142, the warning of Charles V.) Experience had taught them that political commotions, revolts, and civil wars are the inevitable consequences of religious schism, and these they were anxious to provide against. A glance at the sad condition of those countries over which the disasters of religious wars had passed made rulers, whose realms had as yet es-

Hosted by Google

by the favor and protection of princes and magistrates. Nearly all the people were loyal to the ancient faith, and had not the most remote thought of making any change in their religion. The Polish peasants, like those of German descent, embraced the religion that had been introduced by the nobles. In Sweden, Gustavus Vasa, who had conquered the independence of his country, professed the new teachings, because he desired to bring to the support of his throne the wealth and the power that had been taken from the clergy. In England, the divorce of *Henry VIII.*, and the quarrel to which it gave rise between himself and the Pope, was the occasion of the Reformation." The testimony of these writers is corroborated by that of Frederic the Great in his Memoirs. "If the causes," said he, "which promoted the spread of the Reformation be reduced to their last analysis, they will be found to be as follows: *In Germany it was interest; in England lust; and in France a love of novelty.*" [1]

It may be here remarked that of all those princes who were so enthusiastic for the Reformation, there was not a single one distinguished for honesty of conduct or purity of morals. We have only to compare the impure and bloodthirsty Henry VIII.; the sensual *Philip of Hesse*; the unbelieving and frivolous *Albert* of Prussia; the despotic *Christiern II.* of Denmark; and the equally despotic *Gustavus Vasa* of Sweden, with contemporary Catholic princes like *George*, Duke of Saxony; *Joachim*, Elector of Brandenburg; the Emperors *Maximilian*, *Charles V.*, *Ferdinand I.*, and *Ferdinand II.*; the Dukes of Bavaria, *Albert* and *Maximilian I.*, and many others, and we shall see how incomparably more noble, more pure, and more elevated were the lives of the latter than those of the former.

caped such visitations, more energetic in adopting measures of unusual severity, or crushing out the rising sect the moment it gave tokens of its presence. And, as a matter of fact, this policy saved Spain from the horrors of a religious war. Cf. *Hortig's* Ch. Hist., continued by *Döllinger*, Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 690.

[1] "Si l'on veut réduire les causes du progrès de la réforme à des principes simples, on verra, qu'en Allemagne ce fut l'ouvrage de l'intérêt, en Angleterre celui de l'amour, et en France celui de la nouveauté." (Memoires de Brandenbourg.)

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUATION OF THE HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM—ITS INTERNAL DISSENSIONS.

†*Döllinger*, The Reformation and its Interior Development, Ratisb. 1836 sq. 3 vols. *Perrone*, Il Protestantesimo e la Regola di Fede, 3 pts. in 3 vols., Rome, 1853; Fr. tr., Paris, 1854. *Balmes*, El Protestantismo comparado con el Catolicismo, 4 vols., Barcelona, 1842–1844; Engl. tr., Baltim. 1851. †*Nicolas*, The Relation of Protestantism and all Heresies to Socialism, Mentz and Paderborn, 1853. (Onno Klopp), Studies on Catholicism, Protestantism, and Toleration in Germany, Schaffhausen, 1857. *Gieseler*, Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., pp. 115–382, gives copious quotations from authentic sources, and adds the bibliography incident to the subject. *Frank*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, Lps. 1862, Pt. I. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, Munich, 1867.

§ 335. *General Characteristics of Protestantism.*

The Lutherans, like the Catheri and Waldenses of the Middle Age and kindred sects of an earlier date, professed to restore the true Apostolic Church by abolishing the abuses of the Church Catholic, and setting up *Holy Scripture as the one and only ground of Faith.* This absolute appeal to the authority of the Bible continued to be the underlying principle of the new system, even after discussions upon doctrines the most vital had demonstrated its utter insufficiency, and contradictions the most glaring[1] had proved the necessity of tradition, which the Reformers had so arrogantly rejected.[2] For them a visible, infallible, and sanctifying Church, established by God and *anterior to the Holy Scriptures*, had no longer any meaning. They rejected her authority and denied even her

[1] Such is the opinion of the Protestant theologian, *Werenfels*, whose distich, quoted in Vol. I., may be repeated here:

Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.

[2] Cf. *Lessing's* Axioms against Rev. Pastor Goetze of Hamburg. Complete Works, ed. by *Lachmann*, Vol. X., pp. 133–251. †* *Kuhn*, The Formal Principles of Catholicism and Protestantism, being three articles in the Tübingen Quarterly Review of 1858.

Hosted by Google

existence as a visible organization. In her place they substituted an *invisible Church*, whose members, scattered over the face of the earth, were united in fellowship by hidden and spiritual bonds. The immediate consequence of such a theory was to make doubt a matter of necessity, and *change of teaching*, even in the most important truths of religion, the heritage of all time.[1] Doctrinal teachings were now the result of hazard and caprice, and the age of experimental theology seemed to have dawned upon Europe.

But while the principle of anarchy was thus sanctioned and consecrated by the new religious communities, they saw the necessity of setting up some sort of authority as an indispensable basis of dogmatic teaching for their spiritual society. To this end the *Books of Symbols* were composed;[2] but these could not command an enduring authority, for the reason that they were based on human opinion. The Catholic Church had always taught the necessity of good works. Her enemies misrepresented her teachings, and advocated the doctrine of *justification by faith alone.* As time went on, Lutheranism developed into *Protestantism*, or an unqualified protest against certain doctrines, *not because they were false, but because they were taught by the Catholic Church.* Thus Luther, for no other reason than to be opposed to the Pope, would

[1] *Bossuet*, Histoire des Variations des Églises Protestantes, Paris, 1740, 2 vols.; or, History of Variations of Protestant Churches, Antwerp, 1742; N. Y. 1836; Dublin, 1842, 2 vols., 8vo. *Planck*, Hist. of the Origin and Changes of the Protestant Dogmas. See above, p. 2.

[2] Libri symbolici *Evangelicor.* (Confessio Augustana; Apologia confess. August.; Articuli Smalcaldici; Catechismi Lutheri; Formula Concordiae), ed. *Hase*, Lps. 1837. Corpus libror. symbol., qui in eccl. *Reformatorum* auctoritatem public. obtinuerunt, ed. *Augusti*, Elberf. 1827. Collectio confessionum in eccl. *reformatis* publicatar., ed. *Niemeyer*, Lps. 1840. (Confessiones helveticae tres, supplemented with the Catechism of Geneva; Confessio tetrapolitana, viz., Strasburg, Lindau, Constance, and Memmingen; Confessio Gallica; Confessio Scotica, for the Scottish Presbyterian Church; Confessio Anglica, sive XXXIX. Articuli, for the Anglican High-Church; Confessiones Belgicae; Canones Dordraceni XVII.; the Catechism of Heidelberg of the Palatinate; Confessio Bohemica; Confessio Hungarica; Confessiones Poloniae; Confessiones Marchiae, or the Confessions of the March (of Brandenburg). Cf. *Dieringer*, in Aschbach's Eccl. Cyclopaed., art. *Bekenntnissschriften* (Symbolical writings), and "The Symbolical Books of the Protestant Church being at variance with Scripture and Reason," Lps. 1846.

Hosted by Google

admit Communion neither under one nor both kinds.[1] In the same spirit of childish hostility, the Protestant theologians declined to accept the *calendar* as amended by *Gregory XIII.*, declaring that they could not do so with *a safe conscience*, because the Pope, being Antichrist, took this insidious means of undermining their Church. They had rather be wrong in their astronomical calculations than be corrected by the Pope.[2]

Turbulent passion and wild licentiousness played so conspicuous a part in the Reformation that little or no attention was given to the correction of *morals;* and accordingly it is not surprising to find Luther complaining that there was a worse Sodom under the Gospel than under the Papacy. *Philip of Hesse* said he must have more than one wife, and the Reformers, with gracious condescension, said his demand was just. And what the early apostles of a pure morality did for Philip, the preachers of Berlin did in 1792 for Frederic William II. of Prussia, who told them that life would not be endurable without the company of the agreeable Miss Doenhof.

To put some sort of check upon the licentiousness of the passions, there was no means left except to adopt the remedy of *Zwingli* and *Calvin*, which was nothing less than an *extravagant ecclesiastical and social despotism.*[3]

If there was one thing above another that was lauded by the Reformers, it was the complete emancipation of the human mind from all superstitious practices; but, strange to say, Luther's silly tales about his absurd conflicts with the devil had a wonderful influence in reviving a *belief in magic and diabolical agencies.*

The want of a reliable and infallible rule of faith produced, as it necessarily must, such crushing feelings of doubt and uncertainty in the mind of Melanchthon, that he candidly

[1] See page 103.

[2] The "*Evangelicals*" persisted in this error, in certain parts of Germany, until 1777; in England until 1752; in Sweden until 1753. The erroneous assumptions of the ancient Julian calendar brought on a difference of ten days in 1582, when the vernal equinox fell on the eleventh day of March.

[3] *Döllinger*, in his works, "The (Protestant) Churches and Civil Liberty," "The Church and the Churches," "The Papacy and the States of the Church," pp. 93–156, gives a very unfavorable account of the lengths to which this tyranny was carried.

Hosted by Google

confessed the waters of the Elbe could not supply him tears enough to bewail so gigantic a misfortune.[1] As we have seen, the Reformers, while arrogating to themselves the widest liberty of opinion in matters of faith, punished, where they had the power, all those who dared to differ from them with *the penalty of death.* Among the victims of this *intolerance,* besides the executions ordered by Calvin,[2] were *Sylvanus,* a Reformer and inspector of Ladenburg, who was beheaded December 23, 1572, in the market-place of Heidelberg,[3] by the advice of Olevian, for denying the Blessed Trinity; *Nicholas Antoine,* a preacher, who was charged with Judaism, and burnt alive at Geneva; *Funk,* a follower of Osiander's, who was beheaded in 1601; and the Chancellor *Crell,* a Crypto-Calvinist, who was also beheaded in 1632 at Dresden.[4] Heretics were also executed in Sweden, at Koenigsburg, Lübeck, and other cities.[5] It is noteworthy that these executions were the result, not of passion or intemperate haste, but of cool deliberation and mature judgment. Beza and Melanchthon advocated the *execution of heretics* on general principles, and the latter agreed with Luther in authorizing the *murder of tyrants.*[6] Civil war, an obliteration of the spirit of patriotism, and the introduction of foreigners to settle domestic difficulties were everywhere the consequences of the Reformation. Thus Englishmen were invited to France and Scotland; Frenchmen to Germany; Dutchmen to England; Englishmen to Holland; Russians to Poland; and Turks to Hungary.

[1] *Döllinger,* The Reformation and its Internal Development, Vol. I., pp. 280–348; 384 sq.; Vol. III., p. 640 sq.

[2] See p. 148 sq.

[3] According to *Haeusser,* Hist. of the Rhenish Palatinate, Vol. II., pp. 45 sq., in the Catholic organ of the Diocese of *Freiburg,* year 1864, nros. 8, 9.

[4] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers,* Vol. III., pp. 528–545.

[5] See *Arnold's* Hist. of the Church, Vol. II., p. 643. Apud *Döllinger,* The Church and the Churches, p. 81.

[6] *Walch's* ed. of Luther's Works, Vol. XXII., pp. 2151 sq. Cf. *Strobel,* Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 170. *Ukert,* Life of Luther, Vol. II., p. 46, and especially the Essay, inscribed "The Political and Religious Assassination," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers,* Vol. IX., pp. 737–770.

Hosted by Google

§ 336. *The Protestant Clergy—Their Rights—Their Relations to the State.*

Cf. the three excellent articles on the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Reformation and its constant influence on the Protestant Canonists of the Day (*Stahl, Puchta, Richter, Klee, etc.*), in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 596 sq.; Vol. X., pp. 209 sq., pp. 529 sq. See also *Walters'* Manual of Canon Law, 13th ed., § 38–42, and *Gieseler's* Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 352–390.

Luther left no means untried to gain the masses, and as he had said, in speaking of the priesthood, that God would destroy "*this lifeless spiritualism*," so he also invested every layman with the *sacerdotal* character, and appealed to Scripture as authority for his act. He soon learned, however, that he had gone too far, and that some sort of authoritative character must necessarily attach to the office of a clergyman. In theory, ministers were to be chosen by the congregations, but in matter of fact the choice lay with the *Consistories*, wherever it had previously belonged to the bishops. These Consistories, which were composed of laymen and ecclesiastics, were empowered to decide all questions relating to marriage, excommunication, and the administration of justice in cases where clergymen were concerned. The articles of parochial visitation published by Augustus, Elector of Saxony (1557), afford some curious information on the subject. "Nobles and other feudal lords," we are told, "gather together from all sides destitute artizans and illiterate boors, and thrust them into parishes, or, it may be, put the habit of a priest upon their own secretaries, their jockeys and their grooms, in order to have shepherds to their own liking, and to secure for themselves as much of the revenues as may be necessary for their needs." As a consequence, the clergy of the Reformed Church were both ignorant and immoral. There being no longer any hierarchical orders, the rights and prerogatives formerly belonging to bishops became the heritage of all pastors.[1] The *scriptural*

[1] *Articuli Smalc.* apud *Hase*, libri symb., p. 354: Constat, jurisdictionem illam communem excommunicandi reos manifestorum criminum pertinere ad omnes Pastores. Hanc tyrannice ad se solos (Episcopos) transtulerunt et ad quaestum contulerunt.

Hosted by Google

appellation of "*bishop*" was changed by these hypercritical *biblical* theologians into "superintendent."

In the *Church of England* alone of all the Reformed churches was *the episcopacy held to be of divine institution;* although it seems never to have entered the minds of those who proclaimed this theory that the chain of apostolic succession was broken by the severance of England from the Catholic Church.[1]

Strange to say, the Reformers, having neither an accredited mission nor a valid succession, continued to go through the form of investing their clergymen with ministerial authority. Luther boasted that his commission was extraordinary and of an exclusively divine character. My commission, said he, is not from man, but from God, and conveyed through a special revelation from Christ. But from "*any one else*, who rashly took upon him to preach the Gospel, he demanded a miraculous authentication of his mission." Luther inconsiderately held out to princes as the price of their good-will the tempting reward of the spoils of churches and convents. They accepted the bribe with avidity, and having dissolved the monasteries, replaced the peaceful communities of monks with bands of *dissolute soldiers*. Very little, however, of the spoils was devoted to either scientific or religious purposes, or to the social improvement of the people. The wealth thus easily acquired was made to minister to the luxury and pleasure of the new proprietors. Luther raged and stormed, but to no purpose. The ministers of the Gospel, with their wives and children, were starving before his eyes, insulted by the brutal mob, and spurned by the no less brutal nobles, and he was powerless to aid them.

With the help of the princes, Luther and his followers had abolished the sacred privileges of the hierarchy. To the princes they surrendered, sometimes peaceably, and sometimes compelled by force, the supreme spiritual authority, and having done so, they made them their masters, and set up the institution of "*Caesaropapacy*." This secular supremacy in spiritual affairs was thenceforth unlimited in its claims,

[1] See page 210, note 2.

Hosted by Google

and more arrogant in its assumptions than the Byzantine despotism of the Lower Empire.[1]

The princes became at once the defenders of the Reformed Church against its external foes, and in some sort the conservators of unity against its own members, whose interminable dissensions and schisms were constantly threatening it with dissolution. It is, however, somewhat amusing to learn that the *Conventicle of Naumburg* (1554), presided over by Melanchthon, adduced the Scriptural texts "*Attollite portas, principes, vestras*" (Ps. XXIII., 7), and "*Et erunt reges nutritii tui*" (Isai. XLIX., 23) as arguments going to prove the necessity of making the Church dependent upon princes. This is only another instance of the saying that anything may be proved from the Bible.[2]

With these precedents before him, *Stephani* had no difficulty in demonstrating, of course by the authority of the Bible, the existence of that peculiar *episcopal system*, which was taken for granted in the Peace of Augsburg, and according to which the jurisdiction of bishops was transferred to the sovereigns of the countries in which they severally resided. As a consequence, the "*territorial system*," or that embodied in the maxim "*cujus regio, illius religio*," was sanctioned, and some time later found advocates and defenders in the pietists *Thomasius* and *Boehmer*. It was claimed that ecclesiastical supremacy, being essential to the maintenance of public peace, belonged of right to the civil ruler, and that he therefore became, *by virtue of his office as sovereign*, the head of the Church in the country over which he ruled. This principle was by degrees practically carried out in Denmark, where the authority of the king was recognized as absolute in spiritual affairs, and the people were forced to change their religion at his bidding, as they would their dress.[3] By the Peace of West-

[1] *Döllinger*, The Church and the Churches, etc., p. 53 sq.

[2] See the acts in *Camerarii*, vita Melanchthonis, ed. *Strobel*, p. 319; Melanchthon's German Scruples, Vol. II.; and in the "Harmless Reports" of 1714, pp. 541–553. Cf. *Menzel*, l. c., Vol. III., p. 530 sq.

[3] Concerning the arbitrary methods of princes in dealing with spiritual affairs, cf. *Wolfgang Menzel*, Hist. of the Germans, ch. 420. It was a common remark that the wives of these truculent ministers used to be constantly saying

Hosted by Google

phalia, princes were *legally* invested with the *jus reformandi.* Thus, as in the old Pagan times, so now, there were formed *State Religions*, *National Religions*, and *Religions by Law Established.* This national system received its fullest and most perfect expression in the "*Established Church of England*," but the name would have been more appropriate had the phrase "*Religious Community*" been adopted, instead of the word "Church."

Luther and the English Reformers, in their translations of the New Testament, did not uniformly hit by accident on the term "*community*" or "*congregation*," instead of "*church.*"[1] The Reformation placed the Church completely in the power of princes, and the warnings of Luther, the protests of Melanchthon, the more recent theories of the *collegiate system*,[2] and Calvin's teaching, embodied in the proposition "*ecclesia est sui juris*," have each and all been utterly powerless to rescue Protestant religious communities from the despotism of the State.

§ 337. *Worship and Discipline.*

Bibl. Agendor., ed. by *Koenig*, Zelle, 1726, 4to. *Funk*, Spirit and Form of the Worship established by Luther, Berlin, 1819. *Grueneisen*, De Protestantismo artibus haud infesto, Stuttg. 1839, 4to. *Gieseler*, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 390 sq.

From the foundation of the Church down through every succeeding age, the Sacrifice of the Mass had been the great central act of Catholic worship, and the great source of religious and spiritual life. But the Reformers did not think so, and they accordingly abolished the Mass, and substituted *preaching* in its stead. The poor and barren word of man took the place of the stupendous and life-giving mystery of God, and it is not wonderful that the interest of the people in religion became enfeebled and their hearts chilled. Once

to them: "Write, my dear husband, write in such a way that you may not lose your parish."

[1] Cf. Dr. *Sylvius*, The Church and the Gospel, or Catholic Protestation against Protestantism calling itself a "*Church*," Ratisbon, 1843.

[2] Advocated later on, especially by *Pfaff.* Cf. § 375.

Hosted by Google

the use of the popular tongue had been introduced in the various rites and ceremonies, it became evident that the people must play a more prominent part in religious assemblies. In 1526, when Luther introduced for the first time his own form of worship and ecclesiastical organization, conscious, *for the moment*, of their many deficiencies, he considerately announced that it was not his purpose to abridge any one's religious freedom, nor did he intend to prescribe his own ritual as something permanent and unchangeable.[1] Consistently with his contemptuous hatred of whatever evoked a memory of the old Church, and with his exclusive and narrow-minded views of the apostolic age, he manifested a barbarous aversion to the glorious creations of *Christian art*, and once more *revived* by the destruction of images the spirit of *iconoclasm*, which received a fresh impulse from the almost forgotten *Caroline Books*,[2] now for the first time issued from the printer's press. But his judgment of art and its influence was materially modified by the stand he was obliged to take against the iconoclastic fury of Carlstadt, and he sometimes condescended to speak with admiration of *Albert Dürer* and *Luke Cranach*. The sphere in which artistic genius was permitted to move by the requirements of the Reformed system was, however, very limited.

The *cycle of feasts* had been greatly reduced, but still, notwithstanding that there were many places in which the old Germans delighted in celebrating the festivals of the Blessed Virgin, the artist was forbidden to represent her as the *Sorrowful Mother of God*.

Of all the arts, Luther delighted most in *music*.[3] He introduced popular church-song, the text of which was chiefly borrowed from the old hymns of the Church, partly from the canticles of the Bohemian Brethren, and partly composed by himself. The best of his religious songs are taken from an ancient collection of Catholic hymns, among which may be instanced the ones beginning: "There came an angel bright

[1] *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. X., p. 266 sq.
[2] See Vol. II., p. 221.
[3] *Walch*, Luther's Works, Vol. X., p. 1723.

Hosted by Google

and fair" (Es kam ein Engel hell und klar); "In the midst of life are we" (Mitten wir im Leben sind); and, "O head with blood and wounds unsightly made" (O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden, etc.) Religious songs that are wholly Protestant in origin are so dogmatic in tone and contradictory in spirit that when they are not disgusting they are ludicrous. Those of the Anabaptists and Moravian Brethren, when not stupidly dull and moralizing, are fantastic and licentious.[1] From what has been said, it should not be inferred that Luther is the father of *German* church-song. On the contrary, hymn-books in use in the Catholic Church [2] long anterior to Luther contain choral melodies which were very generally sung everywhere by the people during divine service. During the Middle Ages, monasteries were not only nurseries of learning, they were also the home of the arts, none of which was cultivated with more care and assiduity than music, and particular attention was given to the soul-inspiring choral-song. Luther drew his melodies from the antiphoners of the Catholic Church, and set them to German text. *Walther*, *Selneccer*, and *Burk* did the same, their melodies being only imitations of Catholic Church songs. Since the investigations of *Meister* have been made public, it has become a matter of very serious doubt whether Luther is really the

[1] The following expositions of the Lutheran teaching on *justification*, and the contemptuous *expressions relative to the Pope*, are among the more remarkable specimens:

"Herr Jesu nimm mich Hund beim Ohr
Wirf mir den Gnadenknochen vor;
Und schmeiss mich Sündenlümmel
In deinen Gnaden Himmel.

Nun das ist doch die Sache
Daran uns Alles liegt;
Lamm, nimm uns in die Mache
Und mach uns recht vergnügt.

Erhalt uns Gott bei deinem Wort
Und steur' des Papst und Türken Mord,
Die Jesum deinen Sohn
Stürzen wollen von seinem Thron."

Cf. *Buchmann*, Popular Symbolism, 2d ed., Mentz, 1844; Vol. I., pp. 8–10; Vol. II., p. 193.

[2] See Vol. II., p. 1032.

Hosted by Google

author of a *single one* of the melodies attributed to him.[1] Luther had only retained two Sacraments, viz., *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, but, as a badge of distinction between his own and the "*heretical*" Reformed Church, he kept also the Sacramental of Exorcism. When *Crell*, the Chancellor to Christian I., Elector of Saxony, desiring to harmonize the extreme views of the Lutherans and Calvinists, made an attempt to abolish exorcism, the Lutheran clergy of Zeitz and Dresden incited the people to rise against him. "There was a diabolical malice in the joy manifested by the coterie of theologians and jurists in being able to keep Crell shut up in a squalid dungeon. When the poor man, emaciated and half dead, was brought forth from his confined and noisome den on the Koenigstein, it was only to be decapitated at Dresden. The executioner cried out: 'This is indeed a Calvinistic blow.'"

When it became evident that the much-lauded principles of *Christian freedom* were not productive of the best fruits, and that they sometimes conflicted with the *official theology* of princes, a more severe discipline was introduced. To enforce it, recourse was had to fines, exclusion from the Lord's Supper, and denial of the privileges of ecclesiastical sepulture. The character of the discipline of the Reformed Churches of Scotland and Geneva[2] was gloomy and repulsive; and in many parts of Germany, notably in Weimar, Jena, and Brunswick, it degenerated into absolute cruelty.[3] In the last named city, *Henning Brabant*[4] overthrew the aristocratic government, and in its stead set up a democracy, which, strange to say, proclaiming itself an enemy of all tyranny, was quite as impatient of the yoke of the clergy as it had been of that of the aristocracy. Henning was solemnly excommunicated by

[1] *C. Winterfeld*, Dr. Martin Luther's Religious Songs, together with the System of Music employed during his Lifetime, etc., Lps. 1841. Against that, *Meister*, The Catholic German Church-song and System of Music, Freiburg, 1862, 2 vols.; see Vol. I., pp. 29, 30.

[2] *Zeller*, The Theological System of Zwinglius, Tübing. 1853, p. 16 sq. *Kober*, Excommunication, Tübing. 1857, p. 16 sq.

[3] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 528–545.

[4] *Strombeck*, Henning Brabant, Burgomaster of the City of Brunswick, and his Contemporaries, Brunswick, 1829. *A. Menzel*, l. c., Vol. V., p. 229. See also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 319, and "*Melanchthon's* View."

Hosted by Google

the Lutherans, who, to incite the hostility of the people against him, spread the rumor that they had seen him pursued through the streets of the city by the devil under the guise of a raven. The credulous and superstitious inhabitants deserted their leader, and permitted him to be seized and put to inhuman torture. His limbs were dislocated and severed upon the rack, his body indecently mutilated, and an end was not put to his terrible sufferings until after his ferocious executioners had torn out his heart, and struck the dying man on the mouth with it. This indomitable man expired September 17, 1604, and his last words were those of indignant rebuke. "This," said he, "is what is called fighting for one's country."

§ 338. *Protestant Exegetics.*

See Vol. II., § 286, for sources on this subject. *Reuss*, Hist. of Holy Writ, 4th ed., Brunswick.

The early Reformers despised all purely human learning, demanding that the works of Plato and those of Aristotle, "that destroyer of souls, who knew next to nothing of philosophy," should be burnt; and the more this aversion increased, the more did they extol Holy Scripture, representing it as the *one* source of faith, and *claiming the widest inspiration for its contents.*[1] Luther gave a clear and intelligible exposition of certain portions of *Genesis*, the *Psalter*, and the *Epistle to the Galatians*, often translating and drawing out the meaning of the words of Holy Writ in simple, popular, and persuasive language; but at times interspersing his comments with coarse invectives, "distorting," as Zasius says, "the whole Bible into a series of menaces and curses against popes, bishops, and priests."

Melanchthon began the study of the Scriptures at an early age, and, by his extensive knowledge of Hebrew, was enabled to give a tolerably satisfactory explanation of the literal sense of the Old Testament. Following the rule of St. Augustine,

[1] Codicem hebraeum V. T. tunc quoad consonas tunc quoad vocalia sive puncta ipsa sive punctorum saltem potestatem et tum quoad *res* tum quoad *verba* θεόπνευστον esse. (Formula consensus helvetica can. II.)

Hosted by Google

that only by a knowledge of the New Testament can a full understanding be had of the Old, he supplemented his work by the addition of dogmatical and allegorical commentaries.

Matthew Flacius endeavored to reduce exegetics to a scientific system (*Clavis sacrae Scripturae*), a plan which he pursued in his work entitled "A Compendium of the New Testament" (*Glossa Compendiaria in N. T.*) These labors on Holy Scripture were still further advanced by *Wolfgang Franz* in his Hermeneutics (*Tractatus theologicus*, etc., Vit. 1619), and by *Solomon Glassius* in his Sacred Philology (*Philologia sacra*). Other Lutheran interpreters, like *Wolfgang Musculus* († 1563), *David Chytraeus*, and *Martin Chemnitz*, following in the wake of those who had gone before them, never lost sight of their Confession, as set forth in their *Books of Symbols* (*Regula seu analogia fidei*), when writing *polemical* commentaries on the text of Holy Writ. They were impatient of whatever seemed contradictory to the teaching of the Bible, and hence their ignorant hostility to the discoveries of the great *Kepler*.[1]

In the Reformed Church, *Calvin*,[2] following in the footsteps of the Reformers *Zwingli*, *Œcolampadius*, *Bucer*, and *Leo Judae*, the German translator of the Bible, all of whom were acute scriptural commentators, and approaching the study of Holy Writ in a profoundly religious frame of mind, seems to have caught the spirit of the elevated thoughts it contains, and to have set them forth with unusual clearness. This is especially noticeable in his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. He rarely deviates from the rule that "*brevity and clearness are the chief merits of an interpreter*;" but he is frequently most unscrupulous and audacious in his attempts to make St. Paul responsible for his own rigorous and repulsive system. The Latin translation of the Bible by *Sebastian*

[1] Cf. *Wolfg. Menzel*, Hist. of the Germans, ch. 430. *Baron de Breitschwerdt*, The Life and Labors of John Kepler, Stuttg. 1831. *C. Gruner*, John Kepler, Stuttg. 1868. *A. Menzel*, Vol. V., pp. 117–126.

[2] This exegetical work has but recently been published in two editions, and recommended by *Tholuck* in his *Literary Index*, year 1831, nros. 41 sq.; its merits are more critically estimated by *Fritzsche*, in his Essay on the services rendered by Tholuck to the cause of biblical interpretation, Halle, 1831, p. 109. *Escher*, De Calvino, N. T. interprete, Ultraj. 1841.

Hosted by Google

Castellio possessed all the elegance and purity of the classic age, but it was no longer the Bible, and even the style had lost its masculine vigor and peculiar character. This stimulated *Theodore Beza*, who called it "the work of Satan," to make another translation, in which he endeavored to preserve the Oriental peculiarities of style.

We are chiefly indebted for the progress made in philological exegetics to *Conrad Pelican*, and next to him the honor is shared by the *Buxtorfs*, father and son, professors of the Oriental languages at Basle, who brought to their work vast stores of Talmudic and Rabbinic lore.[1] *Thomas Erpenius* († 1627) and his celebrated scholar, *James Golius*,[2] contributed largely toward facilitating the study of the Arabic dialect; and *Samuel Bochart* illustrated the geography (*Phaleg et Kanaan*) and natural history (*Hierozoicon*) of the Bible. While these labors were in progress, a controversy arose concerning the origin of the Hebrew vowel-points (*Louis Capellus*) and the purity of the Greek in the New Testament (*Henri Étienne*). Rising above the prejudices of his predecessors, *Hugo Grotius*,[3] the most distinguished humanist of his age, in his commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, written with commendable impartiality, and showing an extensive acquaintance with philology, paid little attention to the question of inspiration or to the plan of harmonizing the Sacred Text with the Book of Symbols, disregarding in these particulars the traditionary methods of his own sect. His example led the way to a better feeling and to the adoption of more temperate views in religious matters. *Coccejus*, a professor of Leyden, took a directly opposite course; and so marked was the antagonism between the two, and so dissimilar their methods, that it became a common saying among the orthodox zealots, that the one found Christ everywhere in Scripture and the other not at all.[4]

[1] Lexicon chaldaicum, talmudicum, et rabbinicum, completed by his son, 1640.

[2] His Arabic dictionary remained down to our own day, and ,previously to the publication of that by *Freytag*, the very best in use for the study of the language.

[3] Annotationes ad V. T., Par. 1644, ed. *Doederlein*, Halae, 1775 sq, 3 T., 4to. Annotationes in N. T., 1641 sq., 2 T., ed. *Windheim*, Halae, 1769, 2 T., 4to.

[4] *Hossbach*, Spener and his Age, 2d ed. by Schweder, Berlin, 1853, p. 185.

Hosted by Google

§ 339. *Mystics and Visionaries.*

Arnold, though not free from prejudice, treats this subject with greater fullness than any other author, in his History of the Church and Heresies. *Kromayer*, De Weigelianismo, Rosae-crucianismo et Paracelso, Lps. 1669. *Gieseler*, Manual of Ch. Hist., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 433 sq. *Henry Schmid*, Hist. of Pietism, Noerdlingen, 1863.

The religious tendency of the works of *John Tauler*, *Thomas à Kempis*, and the earlier mystics, and notably of the author of the *German Theology*, had exercised a powerful influence upon Luther and other members of the various Protestant denominations. The interior spirit which they tended to foster is quite perceptible in the work "*On True Christianity*," in four books (after 1605), by *John Arndt*, Superintendent of Lüneburg († 1621). This work, portions of which are literally, and the whole of it substantially, pirated from the writings of earlier mystical authors, has obtained a lasting popularity.[1] The same spirit pervades the works of *John Gerhard*, professor at Jena († 1637), in whose profound, yet tender theology (*Loci theologici*; *Confessio theologica*), a strong tendency toward mysticism (*Schola pietatis*) is plainly visible. It is still more prominent in the "Kiss of Spiritual Love" and the "Hours of Spiritual Edification" (*Geistlicher Liebeskuss; Geistliche Erquickstunden*), by *Henry Müller*, of Rostock († 1675); in the "Spiritual Treasure of the Soul," and "Theophilus' Occasional Devotions" (*Geistlicher Seelenschatz; Gotthold's zufällige Andachten*), by *Christian Scriver*, of Rendsburg († 1693); and pre-eminently so in the "Sacred Songs" of the pious *Paul Gerhard*. Born in the year 1606, in the Electorate of Saxony, he afterward became a deacon of the Church of St. Nicholas, in Berlin, whence he was obliged to fly, because he had opposed the union between the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches (1666), and he ended his days as chief pastor of Lüben, in Lusatia, in 1676. It was during

[1] New edition, with biographical notices, by *Krummacher*, Lps. 1847, and by the Evangelical Book-concern, Berlin, 1847. Cf. *Niedner*, Hist. of the Christian Church, p. 759.

Hosted by Google

the darkest period of his life, when weighed down with grief and sorrow, and persecuted by every one, that he wrote his most exquisite hymns. The tender religious feeling and deep pathos expressed in the lyrics "Unto the Lord commend thy ways;" and "Rejoice, my heart, and sing" (*Befiehl du deine Wege; Wach auf mein Herz und singe*), will attest to coming generations how pure and holy was the poetical fire that glowed in the bosom in this exemplary pulpit orator.[1]

According to the theory of *Valentine Weigel*,[2] a preacher at Meissen, there exists an interior illumination, revealing to man the true meaning of the Word of God, as set forth in Holy Writ, and guiding him to a knowledge of true science. In comparison of this inspired knowledge, all purely human learning is empty and calculated only to lead the mind astray. Weigel also held that Christ came upon the earth in the guise of flesh and blood, and this doctrine gave rise to the sect of the *Weigelians*.

In the writings of *Paracelsus* (i. e. Hohenheim) mysticism assumed a theosophic[3] character. Paracelsus was a Swiss physician, born at Maria Einsiedeln, about the year 1493, and died a Catholic at Salzburg in 1541. While leading a roaming life, he was a diligent chemist, and is the accredited author of a religious system, which is a compound of theology, medicine, chemistry, physics, and natural history.[4] He held that the action of God in the order of grace is analogous to that in the order of nature. Hence, he said, chemistry

[1] Spiritual Hymns of *Paul Gerhard*, according to the edition published during his life, Stuttg. 1843. *Trepte*, P. Gerhard, Delitsch, 1828. *Roth*, P. Gerhard, Lps. 1829. New ed. by *Wackernagel*, Stuttg. 1855.

[2] The Golden Rule (*Der güldene Griff*), or an Unerring Guide to all Knowledge, Neustadt, 1617, 4to. To his school belongs Theologia Weigelii (i. e. profession of faith), Neustadt, 1618, 4to. Cf. Francis von *Baader's* Lectures on the Doctrine of Boehme (Pt. II., Vol. IV., of Baader's Complete Works). *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 723–726.

[3] Theosophist is a generic appellation for those Mystics who claimed to obtain a knowledge of the mysteries of being by an internal and supernatural illumination. This knowledge was twofold, embracing both the natural and the supernatural. The Theosophists were also called Fire-philosophers. (Tr.)

[4] His Works, Basle, 1589 sq., 5 vols., in 4to. *Rixner* and *Siber*, The Life and Doctrines of Celebrated Physicians, 1829, nro. 1. *Preu*, Theology of Paracelsus, Berlin, 1839.

Hosted by Google

furnishes the key to the various changes that go on, not only in the material, but also in the spiritual world, and by its agency and instrumentality man should be able to discover the elixir of life and the philosopher's stone.

This same idea was developed with striking originality by *Jacob Böhme*, a cobbler of Görlitz († 1624), who from his very infancy fancied he had divine revelations,[1] and in his mystical system professed to make the mysteries of the spirit perfectly intelligible by means of the symbols and formulae of chemistry and physics. His views were the views of a visionary, vast and gorgeous, but lacking in definiteness and eluding his mental grasp; and his ideas, though strikingly profound, were obscure and involved in inextricable confusion. The diffusion of these mysterious doctrines led to the belief in the existence of a secret society, which, possessing some occult knowledge of nature and the philosopher's stone, was silently preparing the way for the regeneration of the moral world; whose leader was an unknown man named *Rosenkreuz*, and whose origin was lost in the dim mist of ages (*Rosicrucians*). It is likely that the belief in the *existence* of such a society was strengthened by the writings of *John Valentine Andreä* († 1654), who, in his three works, "*The Chemical Affinities of Christian Rosenkreuz*,"[2] "*The Fame of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross*," and "*The Confession of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross*," gave an ideal description of an association of this character. Its aim and duty, according to him, were the study of nature and the search after truth. It is probable,

[1] See his works, edited by *Gichtel*, Amst. 1682, 2 vols., 4to; 1730, 6 vols., by *Scheibler*, Lps. 1831 sq. *Wuller*, The Life and Doctrine of Jacob Boehme, Stuttg. 1836. Cf., above all, *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 726–740.

[2] The Fama Fraternitatis R. C. was published at Cassel in 1614; the Confessio Fraternitatis R. C. in 1615; and the Chemical Affinities in 1618. See also Andreä's autobiography, transl. fr. the Latin by *Seybold*, Winterthur, 1799, and *Hossbach*, Jno. Val. Andreä and his Age, Berlin, 1819. The Apap of Andreä Unmasked; together with different essays, illustrative of the ecclesiastical history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by *Papst*, Lps. 1827. **Chr. Gottlieb von Murr*, On the True Origin of the Rosicrucians and Freemasons, Sulzbach, 1803. Cf. *Sigwart*, Hist. of Philosophy, Vol. II., pp. 51–69, and pp. 449 sq. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., pp. 339–403. Fr. tr., Vol. 20, pp. 443, together with full bibliography.

Hosted by Google

however, that his object in these works was not to found or promote secret societies, but rather to satirize and ridicule the follies of his age.

It is not a little strange that men of learning and ability should have been duped by the pretensions of the Rosicrucians. *Robert Fludd* (Robertus de Fluctibus, † 1637) an English physician of liberal education, by combining the theories of the Rosicrucians with the vagaries of Paracelsus, became the author of what is known as the Fire-philosophy.[1]

§ 340. *Controversies within the Reformed and Lutheran Churches.*

Planck, The Protestant System, Vols. IV.–VI., and Hist. of Protestant Theology from the Formula of Concord to the middle of the eighteenth century, Göttingen, 1831. *Heppe*, Hist. of German Protestantism, 1555–1581, Marburg, 1852 sq., 4 vols. *Gieseler*, Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 187 sq. **Hasse*, Ch. H., ed. by *Koehler*, Vol. III., p. 110–131. *Bossuet*, Hist. of the Variations, etc. **Döllinger*, The Reformation, its Development, etc., Vol. III. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 330 sq.

There were exciting controversies among the Protestants, even while they were still in fierce conflict with the Catholic Church. Some of them have been already mentioned. The following summary, which will complete the history of the dissensions by which the Protestant Church was rent from the date of its origin, will also indicate the necessary tendency of the principles upon which it is based:

A.—CONTROVERSIES AMONG THE LUTHERANS.

1. *Antinomian controversy.*—In his Formulary of Ecclesiastical Visitation, Melanchthon had given directions to preachers to insist upon the binding force of the *Law* in exhorting men to repentance, as an efficient means of producing a wholesome fear of God, without which no sincere penitence is possible. To this instruction *John Agricola*, a professor of Wittenberg (1536), and afterward chaplain at the Court of Berlin (1540), took exception. Knowing that Catholics insisted on

[1] His medical and philosophical works were published in French and Latin at Oppenheim and Goude in 1617, 5 vols., fol.

Hosted by Google

good works, he took an opposite course, maintaining that the *Gospel* alone should be preached to Christians. In 1537, in a disputation at Wittenberg, he opposed even Luther, asserting that the Ten Commandments, or the *Law of Moses*, should not be set up as motives to penitence, but only the sufferings and death of the Son of God, according to the teaching of St. Luke, xxiv. 26; St. John, xvi. 8; and Philipp., ii. 5, 12. Luther replied in six dissertations, showing that the Law gives man the consciousness of sin, and that the fear of the Law is both wholesome and necessary for the preservation of morality, and of divine as well as human institutions.[1] Agricola made an humble recantation.[2] This controversy was virtually a refutation of Luther's earlier assertion that man had lost his capacity for doing good. Luther so far modified this assertion as to admit that motives of fear should be employed to lead man to do good; while Agricola maintained that no motive other than love should be employed. The latter, however, failed to distinguish between the Law of Moses and the moral Law of Christ.

2. *Controversy on good works.*—Out of hatred to the Catholic Church, Luther had persistently rejected good works. Melanchthon saw the dangerous results to which this extravagant denial would lead, and set himself to correct it. In the *Augsburg Confession*, but chiefly in the revised edition of his *Loci* or *Hypotyposes* (1535), he affirmed the *necessity of good works* as emphatically as any Catholic could have done. *Amsdorf* at once proceeded to unmask this false brother, and in a discussion with *George Major*, preacher at the castle of Wittenberg, he went the length of quoting St. Paul, whom he supplemented with the authority of Luther, for the doctrine "*that good works are actually prejudicial to salvation.*" The *Religious Conference of Altenburg* (1560), which, it was hoped, would heal these dissensions, served only to intensify

[1] *Walch*, Works of Luther, Vol. XX., p. 2014 sq. *Melanchth.* epp., T. I., p. 915. *Elwert*, De antinomia Agricolae, Tur. 1837. *Nitsch*, On the Law, etc., the Gospel (German Periodical, 1851, nro. 10.)

[2] Mosheim confesses that the recantation he made, when pressed by Luther, was not sincere, and considers Agricola to be chargeable with vanity, presumption, and artifice. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

them.[1] Notwithstanding that Amsdorf, following the example of forbearance set him by Melanchthon, suppressed the words "*to salvation*" (1562), which had given most offense, the controversy was not closed until after his death, which happened in 1574.

3. *The synergistic controversy.*—Starting with the principle of absolute predestination, Luther had asserted that justification is *wholly the work of God*, and altogether independent of the works of the person justified.[2] With a view to soften the harshness and mitigate the terrors of this doctrine, Melanchthon, in the editions of his "*Hypotyposes Theologicae*," published in 1535 and 1543, stated plainly that "God so draws and converts adults that some agency of their wills accompanies His influences." There are three agencies, he went on to say, conspiring in the work of man's justification, viz: the word of God, the Holy Ghost, and the will of man. This view of the cöoperation (*συνεργισμός*) of the will of man with the grace of God was afterward incorporated in the Interim of Leipsig, and was defended by Pfeffinger in a dissertation published by him in the same city. Of this publication *Amsdorf* wrote a refutation.

The professors of the University of Jena, which had been founded in 1547 as a nursery for the propagation and defense of pure Lutheranism, took up the controversy, and maintained that in consequence of original sin, the will of man, far from cöoperating with the grace of God, was a positive hindrance to its action. This view was accepted at the Court of Weimar, whose influence and authority were exerted in support of the opponents of Synergism (1560). But the doctrine found favor even at Jena, and *Victorinus Strigel*, its ablest defender, atoned for his boldness by imprisonment. *Flacius* was chiefly instrumental in bringing Strigel to punishment. In a disputation that took place between them at Weimar in 1560, the former maintained the original sin was not merely

[1] Acta colloquii Altenburg., Lps. 1570, fol. *Loeber*, Ad hist. colloq. Altenburg. animadversion., Altenburgi, 1776, 4to.

[2] "Non ille justus est qui multum operatur; sed qui sine opere multum credit in Christum," was one of the "Paradoxes" he offered to maintain against all comers at Heidelburg in 1518. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

an *accident* in man, as Strigel claimed, but of his very *substance;* from which the obvious conclusion was drawn that man is a creature of Satan, and incapable of being redeemed. By a doctrine so revolting, Flacius alienated the affection of his friends, before whose hostility he was obliged to fly. He died at Frankfort, March 11, 1575, in a state of destitution.[1]

4. *The Osiandrist controversy.*—The opinions of Agricola were again revived by *Andrew Osiander* in his inaugural address (1549) as head of the Theological Faculty of the newly-founded University of Koenigsberg. He also combated Luther's teaching on justification, maintaining that man is justified, not by imputation or a *judicial sentence of God declaring him so, but by an actual indwelling of Christ as God making him so*; and, hence that *sanctification* is an essential condition to justification. As a corollary to this, he held that justification is wrought in man by the power of the *Divine* and not of the Human Nature of Christ.[2] This doctrine was opposed not only at Koenigsberg, but in many other cities of Germany. Among those most conspicuous for their active hostility to it were *Staphylus* of Osnabrück and *Francis Stancari*, both of whom were professors at Koenigsberg. Stancari was an Italian, who had been expelled for his heretical opinions from the University of Mantua. From Mantua he went to Switzerland, whence he was also expelled by the Calvinists, and in 1548 became professor of Hebrew at the university over whose Theological Faculty Osiander presided. His views on justification were diametrically opposed to those of Osiander. He maintained that the mediatorship of Christ is to be attributed to His *Human*, and not to His *Divine* Nature. Numerous opponents at once rose up against him; fierce

[1] *Ritter*, The Life and Death of Flacius, Frankfort and Lps. (1723). *Twesten*, Flac. Illyr., etc., Berlin, 1844. *Schmid*, Flacius' Controversy on Original Sin, from a hist. and lit. point of view (Journal of Hist. Theology, year 1849, nro. 1). *Frank*, De Matth. Flac. in libros sacros meritis, Jenae, 1859. *Perger*, Matth. Flac. Illyr. and his Age, Erlangen, 1859 sq. *Otto*, De Victorino Strigelio, liberioris mentis in eccles. Luther. vindice, Jenae, 1843.

[2] *Wilken*, The Life, Doctrine, and Writings of Osiander I., Stralsund, 1844. *Haeberle*, The Doctrine of Osiander (Studies and Criticisms, 1844). *Ritschl*, Osiander's Doctrine of Justification (Annuary of Germ. Theol., by Dorner and Liebner II., nro. 4).

Hosted by Google

controversies broke out among the professors; and the conviction began to dawn upon Duke Albert that in founding the University of Koenigsberg he had been the author of a scourge for himself rather than a blessing. The hearts of its members were filled with feelings of hatred and envy, and, ranging themselves into hostile camps, some became the partizans of Flacius, while others, encouraged by the sympathy of the old aristocracy of the country, formed an opposition party under the lead of *Joachim Moerlin*, a preacher of Koenigsberg.

The whole country was soon in arms against both Osiander and Stancari. The court gave its support to Osiander, after whose death, in 1552, his son-in-law, *John Funk*, became the representative and defender of his opinions.

Stancari, quitting Koenigsberg, passed into Poland, where he became a furious iconoclast; and, after a life spent in roving and fierce controversy, died in the year 1574. So dissolute were the habits of Moerlin, and withal so prodigious his intellectual activity, that some persons, at a loss to account in any other way for his incessant literary labors, seriously asserted that while he was drunk at the festive board the devil took his place at the writing-desk. Moerlin died in 1571, and *Hesshusius*,[1] who succeeded to his leadership, was deprived of this honor, as he had previously been of so many others, for maintaining that Christ should be adored, not only as a *concrete* being, but in His flesh considered *apart* and *independently* of any of His other attributes. The controversy spread over the whole of Prussia, working everywhere manifestations of the fiercest animosity, and was terminated only after the execution of Funk and the publication of the *Corpus doctrinae Prutenicum*, in which Osiander's doctrine was condemned as essentially heretical, and that of Luther declared to be of equal authority with the Symbols.

5. *Crypto-Calvinism.*—Melanchthon, the author of the Augsburg Confession, had, from the very beginning, been suspected

[1] Cf. *Wiggers*, Tilemann Hesshusius and John Draconites, Rostock, 1854. *Wilkens*, T. Hesshusius, a Polemical Theologian of the Lutheran Church, Lps. 1860. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. V., pp. 151, 152.

Hosted by Google

of playing an equivocal part with regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist.[1] Under any circumstances, such duplicity could not remain long concealed, and after the Interim of Leipsig his real sentiments became a matter of notoriety. As a consequence, the divergent views on the Lord's Supper gave rise to two parties, known respectively as the *Lutherans* and the *Philippists*. Melanchthon's teaching concerning the *Adiaphora* was also violently assailed by *Matthew Flacius* of Magdeburg, who maintained that the points which the doctor claimed were matters of indifference could not be so regarded. Toward the close of his life, Melanchthon inclined toward Calvin's teaching concerning the Lord's Supper, and, without saying a word to any one on the subject, changed the tenth article of the Confession of Augsburg in such a way as to express his own belief. He was driven to make this change by the course of *Brenz*, who, besides proclaiming his belief in the theory of the omnipresence or *ubiquity of the Body of Christ*, made the doctrine obligatory upon the Church of Würtemberg.

The contests between the two parties were bitter and vehement. The Philippists were anxious not to alienate the affections of Augustus, Elector of Saxony, who professed the doctrine of Luther, though he knew as little about it as his butler. By the Convention of Torgau (1574), therefore, they put on the semblance of Lutheranism, while they detested its reality. But Melanchthon was not without friends at court. He had there a considerable and quite an influential party, at the head of which was his son-in-law, *Peucer*, physician in ordinary, and one of the privy counsellors to the elector. *Wigand* and *Hesshusius*, the most ardent champions of the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper, were expelled from Jena in 1573.

The Philippists, now believing themselves all powerful, began to speak openly of rejecting the teachings of Luther; but this candid avowal of their sentiments roused popular indignation against them. Public prayers were offered up in all the churches of Saxony for the extirpation of the Calvin-

[1] See § 316, vers. fin.

Hosted by Google

istic heresy; a medal was struck commemorating the triumph of Christ over the devil and human reason; and of the theologians many ended their days in prison, while others, among whom was the physician, Peucer, languished there for years.[1]

6. *Efforts at Concord, or the Form and Book of Concord.*— The Protestants soon foresaw that these animated controversies and heated discussions, if permitted to go on, would in the end compromise their political supremacy, and they accordingly began to manifest a less obstinate and more accommodating spirit in their dogmatic opinions. In that rigid age the only way of effecting a reconciliation and securing unanimity was by drafting a Confession on strictly scientific principles, which would be acceptable to all. To this work *Jacob Andreä*, the laborious and versatile chancellor of Tübingen, applied himself. He addressed the princes of the different countries on the reunion of the various sections of Protestantism, and was at first repelled by them all, but finally obtained recognition from Elector *Augustus* of Saxony, who took an active interest in the project. Putting himself at the head of the movement, he called a conference, in which the theologians *Martin Chemnitz*, superintendent of Brunswick; *Chytraeus*, a professor of Rostock, and many other divines participated. The result of their labors was the *Book of Torgau*. Taking this as a basis, a number of clergymen, who met at the monastery of *Bergen*, drew up a new symbol, and, after many corrections, finally completed it May 28, 1577. It was designated the Form of Concord (*Formula concordiae*). Its principal authors were *Andreä*, *Selnecker*, and *Chemnitz*. The document was drawn with care; everything that might give offense was omitted; everything that had the flavor of Philippism studiously avoided; the system of Luther[2] was

[1] *Peuceri* Historia carcerum et liberation. divin., ed. *Pezel*, Tig. 1605. *Frimel*, Witteberga a Calv. divexata et divinitus liberata, or Report of the manner in which the sacramentary demon penetrated into Saxony, Witt. 1646, 4to. *Walch*, Bibliotheca theologica, T. II., p. 588 sq. *Calinich*, Struggle and Fall of Melanchthonism in Electoral Saxony, Lps. 1866.

[2] This Formula concordiae apud *Hase*, Libri symb., pp. 570–830. Conf. also, in the Prolegom. locus VII. de Formul. concord. ac Libro concordiae, p. CXXXIV sq.

Hosted by Google

skillfully elaborated and defended; and it was hoped it would prove acceptable to all parties. But no sooner had the Philippists learned that the Calvinistic views had been formally condemned than they protested, and the Form of Concord became a *Form of Discord* (*Concordia discors*),[1] as it was termed by its opponents. It was, however, adopted by the States of the Empire, with a few exceptions, at the Imperial Diet of Dresden, June 25, 1580, and was made of equal authority in matters of faith with the ancient ecumenical councils, the original unchanged Confession of Augsburg, the Apology, the Articles of Smalkald, and the Catechisms of Luther. All these were collectively called the *Book of Concord*, which has always been regarded as the *Great Charter* of German Lutheranism.

The Philippists of the Electorate of Saxony were for the time vanquished; but as they still existed in considerable numbers, and were as tenacious as ever of the opinions, which they ceased to proclaim only because they dreaded the tyranny of princes, they were prompt in turning to their advantage the political changes of the year 1586. The elector, Christian I., and his chancellor, *Nicholas Crell*, were gained to Calvinism, and plans were at once formed for a *gradual* union between the Calvinists and Lutherans. All controversial sermons were forbidden; the most important positions in the parishes and schools were filled by Philippists; subscriptions to the Book of Concord were suspended; and a translation of the Bible, reflecting the spirit of Melanchthon, was commenced. But, in the midst of these preparations, the young prince passed away (1591), and no sooner had *William I.*, Duke of Saxe-Altenburg, the guardian of the heir to Christian I., assumed the duties of government, than rigid Lutheranism was again restored. *Articles of Visitation*, drawn up in a spirit of deadly hostility to Calvinism, were published at Torgau in 1592, and all officers of Church and State were required to accept them under oath.

[1] *Hospiniani* Concordia discors, Tig. 1608, Gen. 1678. *Hutteri* Conc. concors, Vit. 1614, Lps. 1690, 4to. *Anton*, Hist. of the Form of Concord, Lps. 1779, 2 vols. *Goeschel*, The Form of Concord, its Hist., Doctrine, and Influence, Lps. 1858. *Frank*, The Theology of the Form of Concord, Erlangen, 1858.

Hosted by Google

7. *Syncretistic controversy.*[1]—The author of this controversy was *George Calixtus*, a professor at the University of Helmstaedt, and an honest and highly educated man. Like Melanchthon, he was of a conciliatory disposition. He showed that the teachings of the Wittenberg theologians *on the ubiquity of the Body of Christ and the communication of his two Natures* (*Communicatio idiomatum*), as set forth in the Form of Concord, were Eutychian conceptions. The ill-will which this candid avowal excited against him was still further intensified by the publication of his "*Epitome theologiae*" (1619), in which scant notice was taken of those characteristically Catholic and Calvinistic doctrines so obnoxious to the Lutherans. His "*Epitome theologiae moralis*" (1634) gave still deeper offense. In this work, while speaking of the return of *Bartholomew Nihus* to the Catholic Church, he took occasion to say that there were many points in controversy between Catholics and Protestants having no essential bearing on the principles of faith, and that the hope of salvation could not be denied to such well-meaning Catholics as, blinded by the prejudices of birth and education, were sincerely attached to the teachings of their religion. Learning the course pursued by him at the fruitless Religious Conference of Thorn, the Saxon theologians, *Werner Hülseman*, *Scherpf*, and *Calovius*, became his fiercest opponents. They could not endure, they said, such an amalgamation of conflicting beliefs (*Syncretism*). Out of this quarrel grew the *Syncretistic Controversy*, which also revived the discussions on original sin, justification, good works, and the Lord's Supper. The Saxon theologians, by accusing Calixtus of desiring to unite in one brotherhood with the Lutherans, not alone Papists and Calvinists, but also Socinians, Arminians, and even Turks and

[1] *Syncretism* is a term originally applied to an association of political parties, which had combined for the purpose of repelling external foes. The Cretes, we are informed by Plutarch in his work "*On Brotherly Love*," while themselves distracted by internal dissensions, formed such a union for repelling enemies from without, who were threatening them with a common danger. The word was still used by Zwingli and Melanchthon in a good sense; however, the latter was taunted with it as if it were synonymous with a *fusion of religious doctrines* and with hypocrisy and treason. Cf. *A. Menzel*, l. c., Vol. VIII., p. 125. *Herzog's* Cyclopaed., Vol. XV., pp. 342–372.

Hosted by Google

Jews, alarmed the whole of Lutheran Christendom. His death, in 1656, did not put an end to the controversial war, which continued to be waged with unabated fierceness against his son and the entire Faculty of the *University of Helmstaedt.*[1] The Wittenberg theologians were nearly successful in an attempt to force upon the Lutheran Church a new *Symbolical Book* (*Consensus repetitus ecclesiae Lutheranae*), in which, by way of antidote to the conciliatory views of Calixtus, the opinions of the most radical school of Lutheranism were invested with the dignity and authority of articles of faith. The attempt, however, was defeated by the stern resistance of the Jena theologians, of whom *Musaeus* was the most distinguished, and by the determined attitude of the Court of Dresden, which informed its promoters that such a measure could not be carried into effect without the consent of the prince.

8. *Triumph of the Lutheran doctrine.*—The Lutherans and Calvinists of Germany thus found themselves engaged in animated controversies, and separated from each other by feelings of hostile antagonism. Calvinism made few converts, except among the higher classes, and the opposition it met with among the lower orders effectually retarded its progress. Henceforth the fortunes of both systems were dependent on the ability and learning of their respective champions. Had Melanchthon's work, *Hypotyposes theologicae*, continued in use, Calvinism would probably have come off victorious; and its defeat may be mainly ascribed to a series of dogmatical works, which shortly appeared from the pens of such men as *Martin Chemnitz*,[2] *Gerhard*,[3] and *Leonard Hutter*,[4] who, en-

[1] *Henke*, The University of Helmstaedt during the Seventeenth (not sixteenth) Century, or *George Calixtus* and His Age, Halle, 1833 sq., 2 vols. *Gass*, George Calixtus and Syncretism, Breslau, 1846. *Schmid*, Hist. of the Syncretist Controversy in the Age of George Calixtus, Erlangen, 1846.

[2] Loci theol., ed. *Polyc. Leyser*, Fref. 1591, 3 T., 4to, ed. V., Vit. 1690. He became still more renowned as a Controversialist, in his most important work. "Examen Conc. Tridentini," occasioned by a discussion with the Jesuits, ed. *Preuss*, Berol. 1861 sq. *Lentz*, Chemnitz, being a biography, Gotha, 1866.

[3] Loci theol. cum pro adstruenda, tum pro destr. quorumvis contradicentium falsit., Jen. 1610–1625, 9 T., ed. *Cotta*, Tub. 1762–1781, 20 T., 4to, indices adjec. *Müller*, 1788 sq., 2 T., 4to; ed., II. 1767 sq., ed. *Preuss*, Berol. 1863 sq.

[4] *Leon. Hutteri* compendium locor. theol. jussu et auctor. *Christiani II.*, Vit. 1610. (*Hase*) Hutterus redivivus, 10th ed., Lps. 1862, lays down Hutter's

Hosted by Google

joying the reputation of being the ablest theologians of their age, secured a complete triumph to Lutheranism by their masterly defense of its tenets. The power of Chemnitz's influence may be judged from the popular saying, "If Martin (Chemnitz) had not lived, the cause of Martin (Luther) would have perished" (*Si Martinus* (*Chemnitius*) *non fuisset, Martinus* (*Lutherus*) *non stetisset*). It is, however, a trifle amusing to see these men partially reviving in their works what they were pleased to call the *degenerate* scholastic method. The replies of the Calvinists were feeble and comparatively harmless.

B.—CONTROVERSIES AMONG THE REFORMED.

Walch, Historical and Theological Exposition of the Dissensions which have divided the Churches outside of Lutheranism, 3d edition, Jena, 1733 sq., 5 vols. *Schweizer*, The Protestant Central Dogmas within the Reformed Church, Zürich, 1854 sq., 2 vols. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 404–420.

If the controversies that sprung up among the members of the Reformed Church were more easily and effectually controlled than those that had their origin among the Lutherans, the fact is to be mainly ascribed to *the practice of holding synods*, early introduced by Zwingli and Calvin. In Germany the cause of the Reformed Church was greatly strengthened by the declaration of the Elector Palatine, *Frederic III.*, in its favor (1559). At his request, the theologians *Ursinus* and *Olevianus* composed what is known as the "*Heidelberg Catechism*" (1563), which was recognized in Germany as a Symbolical Book, and, owing to the modifications it introduced into the gloomy system of Calvin, and the clear and popular style in which it was written, rose rapidly in public favor.[1] When Louis VI. (1576), after the death of Frederic, succeeded to the government, Calvinism yielded for a time before the advances of Lutheranism, but it again recovered its ascendancy when that prince had passed away (1583).

Some years later, *Maurice*, Landgrave *of Hesse* (1604) and *John Sigismund*, Elector of Brandenburg (1614), influenced more by

Compendium as a foundation, and then shows the development of the dogma by Protestant theologians, particularly in the notes.

[1] See *Augusti*, Corpus libror. symbolicor., pp. 535–577.

Hosted by Google

an alliance with the Netherlands than by motives of conviction, also embraced the Calvinistic Reform. The Reformed teachings were triumphant in the Netherlands after the year 1609, when these provinces, by treaty, practically secured their political independence. But scarcely had the wounds of civil war been healed, when a religious war broke out, occasioned by the enmities existing between the advocates of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic systems. *Arminius*, a professor of Leyden, was commissioned to arbitrate between the *Supralapsarians* and the *Infralapsarians*. The former professed the extreme doctrine of Calvin and Beza, maintaining that God, by an eternal, absolute, and unconditional decree, had predestined some to be saved and others to be lost, even *before* the Fall had brought sin into the world; while the latter, adopting the teaching of Theodore Koornhert and the clergy of Delft, held that while God foresaw the Fall, the formal decree was not made until *after* Adam's transgression. Arminius rejected Calvin's dreadful doctrine of absolute election and reprobation, on the ground that it was incompatible with God's wisdom and goodness; whilst *Gomar*, who was associated with him in the commission, ardently defended it. The two became the leaders of opposing factions, known respectively as the *Arminian* and *Calvinistic Communities*, whose quarrels were seriously detrimental to the interests of the new Republic. On the death of Arminius, his cause was taken up by *Episcopius*, who, as the representative of his party, presented a statement of its doctrines, in the form of a *Remonstrance*, to the assembled States of Holland and West Friesland (1610). The teachings of the *Remonstrants* were ably defended by *Jan van Olden Barneveldt*, the celebrated advocate, and by the great humanist, *Hugo Grotius*, Syndic of Rotterdam,[1] the latter of whom succeeded in obtaining for them a statute of toleration in 1614.

But *Maurice, Prince of Orange*, Stadtholder of the Netherlands and General of the Republic, ambitious of supreme

[1] *Luden*, Hugo Grotius, according to history and his works, Berlin, 1805. *Louis Clarus* (Völk), Hugo Grotius' Return to the Catholic Faith, German transl. from the Dutch of *C. Broere*, ed. by *Schulte*, Treves, 1871.

Hosted by Google

power, and, conscious that the good-will of the Calvinists was essential to the success of his designs, sought to conciliate them by persecuting the Arminians. He accordingly had the venerable Barneveldt arraigned and put to death on the charge of holding Catholic doctrines and being in collusion with the Spaniards. He also condemned Hugo Grotius, together with other Arminians, to perpetual imprisonment; from which, however, the great jurist was fortunate enough to escape after the expiration of two years. As to the religious belief of Grotius, there has been at all times so great a discrepancy of opinion that the polymathist, *Ménage*, wrote the following epigram upon the subject:

> About the belief of Grotius quarrel Socinus,
> Luther and Calvin, Arminius, Rome and Arius.

The excitement continuing to increase rather than diminish, it was thought expedient to convoke another synod for the settlement of the controversy. For this purpose the famous *Synod of Dort*, at which were present representatives from the Reformed churches of every European country except France, convened November 13, 1618, and continued its sittings until the end of April, 1619.[1] Concerning the ultimate decision there was hardly room for doubt; because the Prince of Orange had been victorious over the Republican party, and the members, who were chiefly from the Netherlands, either openly professed Calvinism, or were secretly attached to its teachings. It was obvious, therefore, that the cause of the Arminians had been virtually disposed of *before the opening of the Synod*. To save appearances, however, in the Fifth Session the Remonstrants were cited to be present within fourteen days, and "freely state, explain, and defend"

[1] Acta Synodi nation. Dordr. hab. Lugd. Bat. 1620, fol.; Han. 1620, 4to. Acta et scripta synodal. Dordracena Remonstrantium, Harder. 1620, 4to. See also *Augusti*, Corpus libror. symbolicor., pp. 198–240. *Halesii*, Hist. conc. Dordraceni, ed. *Moshem.*, Hamb. 1824. Essay supplementary to the hist. of the Synod of Dort, Basle, 1825. *Heppe*, Historia synodi nation. Dordracenae s. litterae delegator. ad Landgrav. Mauricium. (*Illgen*, Hist. Review, 1853, p. 225 sq.) *Schweizer*, The Synod of Dort and its Apocrisis. (Journal of Hist. Theology, 1854, nro. 4.)

Hosted by Google

their *Five Articles*,[1] which embodied the questions under discussion. Headed by Simon Episcopius, they appeared on the 6th of December, and, after some preliminary work had been gone through, complained that the dominant party in the Synod, instead of conferring with them as equals, treated them as accused persons put on their defense. No notice was taken of their objection, and being commanded by the moderators to proceed to plead their cause, they again took exception to the order of procedure, insisting that the question of Reprobation should come up first, while the Synod determined to begin with other cognate subjects, and also claimed the right of prescribing the manner in which the debate should be conducted. The Remonstrants refusing to yield, were dismissed, the prolocutor telling them that with a lie they came and with a lie they went away. In the Fifty-seventh Session four canons were framed, condemning the *Five Articles* of the Remonstrants, and, *in the name of the Holy Ghost*, setting forth the extreme doctrines of Calvinism as truths of faith which it is not lawful to controvert.

The substance of these canons may be summed up as follows:

I. Faith is the free gift of God, which by His eternal decree He grants to those whom He has set apart from the beginning. The election has no dependence on any foreseen merit in those elected, and is wholly the result of His sovereign pleasure. While the non-elect, on account of their unbelief and other sins, are left to share the misery of the reprobates who are everlastingly lost, God is nevertheless not to be regarded as the author of their ruin.

II. By the death of Christ, expiation was made only for the sins of the elect, who alone reap the benefit of it.

III. Man's free-will is in no wise instrumental in the conversion of the elect. God is the sole author and finisher of all, granting faith and amendment of life to those whom He has set apart from the beginning.

[1] These were, respectively, On Election and Reprobation, On the Universality of the Death of Christ, On Free Will, On the Working of Divine Grace, and On the Perseverance of the Truly Faithful. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

IV. To the elect God grants complete exemption from the dominion of sin; and should they be guilty of grievous faults, still, by reason of the irreversible decree of election, they never become objects of His wrath, and are never entirely deprived of the assistance of His Holy Spirit.

It is a little amusing to see this theological Synod referring to the promise of Christ "to abide with His Church, even to the end of the world," when, according to the statements of all Protestants, He had given her over for above a thousand years to the most appalling errors. Episcopius and thirteen other ministers were banished the country; the Remonstrant assemblies suppressed; and two hundred preachers belonging to the party deposed. Forty of these passed over to the side of the Counter-Remonstrants, and others entered the Catholic Church. *Gerhard von Vossius*, *Gaspar Barlaeus*, and *Peter Bertius*, the most distinguished of the Leyden professors, were deprived of their chairs in the university. The English and Brandenburg Reformers refused to accept the decrees of the Synod.

After the death of Maurice of Orange (1625), the condition of the Remonstrants was somewhat improved, and in 1636 they were granted freedom of worship. Their opinions were ably defended by Episcopius in his numerous dogmatical treatises, known under the general name of Institutions of Theology (*Institutiones theologicae*). It was not long, however, before they began to quarrel among themselves and to split up into hostile factions, some adopting the Socinian views on the Trinity, original sin, grace, and satisfaction. The *Collegiants*,[1] a name derived from "colleges," the appellation which this eclectic sect gave to its communities, had

[1] *Rues*, The Present State of the Mennonites and Collegiants, Jena, 1743. *Fliedner*, A Begging Tour through Holland, Essen, 1831, Vol. I., pp. 186 sq. The Collegiants admitted into their community all persons professing a belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and willing to accept it as a guide of life. They had no symbol or profession of faith, and permitted the widest diversity of opinion. Their only form of worship consisted of prayer-meetings, held Sundays and Wednesdays, and conducted by any of the members. They held Baptism by emersion to be necessary, and had "Sacramental meetings" of several days' duration twice a year, after the manner of the Scotch Presbyterians. See *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects and Heresies, art. "Collegiants." (TR.)

Hosted by Google

their origin in the Calvinistic and Arminian controversies, and, after the close of the Synod of Dort, continued to hold *separate* meetings for worship. The enemies of all positive faith, they maintained that it was unlawful for a Christian either to take an oath, to hold public office, or wage war; and rejecting the priesthood and every other form of established ministry, they permitted any one who felt inclined to preach and expound the Scriptures.

After the close of the Synod of Dort, the sect of the *Latitudinarians* took its rise in England. Averse to dogmas of any kind, they were especially hostile to rigid Calvinism, and in consequence adopted less gloomy and more lax theories on predestination. The most conspicuous champion of their teachings was *John Hales*, who had been one of the members of the Synod of Dort. Before him, however, *William Chillingworth* had greatly modified the austerity of the extreme Calvinistic views in his work entitled "*The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*,"[1] which obtained a wide circulation. Calvinism underwent a similar modification in France. Its extreme rigorism was denounced by *Cameron* († 1625), whose scholar, *Amyraut*, a professor of divinity at Saumur, publicly undertook the defense of his master in a work entitled "*Universalismus hypotheticus*" (1634), where he maintained that God wishes the salvation of all men; that belief in Christ is essential to salvation; that God gives all the power to believe; and that if men are not saved they have no one to blame but themselves. He added, however, that besides this general and conditional decree, there was a special and unconditional one, in virtue of which God grants saving and irresistible faith *only to the elect*. His followers were called *Amyraldists* or *Hypothetical Universalists*, and were numerous in France and Switzerland. Still later, *le Blanc*, a professor of divinity at Sedan († 1675), took the ground, similar to that taken by Calixtus on the part of the Lutherans, maintaining that the differences between the latter and the Calvinists were of minor importance, and affected no

[1] The last edition of "*The Religion of Protestants, etc.*," by *Dr. Birch*, appeared in 1724.

Hosted by Google

vital point, and hence that the two parties, without any sacrifice of principle, might unite and work in harmony.

§ 341. *Sects among the Protestants.*

Gieseler, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., pp. 48–114. *Erbkam*, Hist. of Protestant Sects in the Age of the Reformation, Hamburg, 1848. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 336 sq. Cf. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Bk. II., p. 461 sq., 5th edit.

Of the *Anabaptists* of Thuringia, Wittenberg, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Westphalia, we have already spoken.[1] After their disastrous discomfiture at Münster, they divided into several branches. The most remarkable of them was the sect of *Baptists* called *Mennonites*,[2] deriving their name from *Menno Simonis*, an apostate Catholic priest († 1561). His energy and activity were such that, in a comparatively short time, his teachings were propagated in Westphalia and the Netherlands, and had even spread as far as Livonia. Under his guidance, the fanaticism of the Anabaptists was changed into a constrained and decorous recollection. He gave to his followers a definite organization, forming them into a society of saints, after the manner of the early Christians. The Mennonites rejected infant baptism; forbade their members to institute proceedings in a civil court of judicature; declared it unlawful to take an oath or wage war; and refused to grant a bill of divorce except in cases of adultery. Even while Menno was still living his sect split into two parties on a point of discipline, some maintaining and others denying that such as fell into sin should be excommunicated, and never be again restored. The adherents of the two parties were known respectively as the "*Fine*" or strict Mennonites, composed chiefly of Flemings; and the "*Coarse*" or lax Mennonites, who were most numerous in the north of Holland, and were on this account sometimes called the Waterlanders. Another split was occasioned by difference of opinion on

[1] See §§ 308 and 317.

[2] *Hunzinger*, The Religion, Church, and Schools of the Mennonites, Spire, 1831. In Holland they were also *Doopsgezinde*, or those who, excluding both immersion and aspersion, baptized by *pouring on* only. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

election and grace (predestination), some adopting the *Calvinistic* and others the *Arminian* theory.

The *Schwenkfeldians* were founded by *Gaspar Schwenkfeld*,[1] a native of Ossig in Silesia. One of the earliest followers of Luther, he soon began to assail many points of his master's teaching, and to find fault with the whole system of the Reformation, in that, instead of fostering true piety and tending to cultivate interior life, it produced in its adherents only a dead faith, and the semblance without the reality of Christianity.[2] Luther's teaching on *Justification* and the *Lord's Supper* was the special object of his attack, and, with a view of bringing the great Reformer over to his way of thinking, undertook a journey, hoping by a personal interview to give greater force to his arguments. Failing in his mission, he returned, and, with the aid of *Valentine Krautwald*, a preacher of Liegnitz, continued to propagate his opinions. While his sincere piety softened the hearts of many, and won them to his cause, his earnestness and zeal excited the jealousy and inflamed the hatred of the Lutheran preachers against him. Though forced to consult for his safety by flight, he continued to maintain friendly relations with many Protestant princes, and to keep up an active controversy with the theologians who opposed him, and by whom he was branded as an archheretic and Eutychian. By the year 1528 his opinions had become widely spread, notably in Alsace and Suabia. The most prominent feature of his teaching was the rejection of all external authority and established forms, and the advocacy of interior life and sincere piety. No other theory of holy living, he said, is worthy of acceptance, and none other had

[1] His writings and letters are in *Walch*, Biblioth. theolog., T. II., p. 67 sq. *A Brief Biography* of Schwenkfeld and his Departure from the Town of Ossig, 1697. Essential Doctrines of *Gaspar von Schwenkfeld* and his Co-religionists, Breslau, 1776. *Rosenberg*, Hist. of the Reformation of Silesia, p. 412. Cf. *A. Menzel*, New Hist. of the Germans, Vol. I., pp. 469–478. *Döllinger*, Hist. of the Reform., Vol. I., p. 226 sq.

[2] Cf. Warning against the Abuse of Several Capital Points of the Gospel, dated June 11, 1524, 4to. He considered as erroneous the following points: 1st. That faith alone justifies; 2d. That man does not enjoy free-will; 3d. That man is unable to keep the commandments of God; 4th. That man's works are without merit; 5th. That Christ has made satisfaction for mankind.

Hosted by Google

any value in his eyes. The faith of the Lutherans, he went on to say, is something wholly external; is destitute of life and vivifying principle; ignores crosses and sufferings; shrinks from the mortification of the passions; and is too nearly allied to the world to give up its pleasures. *Justifying faith*, he continued, can not remain inactive; it must carry on an unceasing conflict of good works against evil passions, and bring under subjection every form of concupiscence. Our Lord's words of Institution in the Eucharist he interpreted as follows: "My Body is this"—a spiritual food which nourishes the *soul* as bread does the body; "My Blood is this"—a spiritual drink which nourishes the *soul* as wine does the body.[1] He had also a novel theory *of the relation of the first to the second creation*. The first, he said, being imperfect, *was supplemented and perfected in the second through the renewal of all things in Christ*. This change was most conspicuously manifest in man. The image of God was only visible in faint outline in Adam; man was still but a creature of the earth earthly, and bore no adequate resemblace to the idea of manhood in the mind of God. But in the second birth, the natural Son, the Son of Mary, was raised to the rank of divine Sonship, being really the Son of God. This view was but a consequence of his conception of the *flesh of Christ*. According to Schwenkfeld, Christ is the Son of God, not only as to His divine, but also as to His *human* nature; and hence, instead of a hypostatic union, he held that there was *a unity of substance in Christ*, thus destroying the reality of His humanity.[2] As his life was far purer and more virtuous than those of his Lutheran adversaries, so were his writings more logical and dignified. He died at Ulm in 1561. There are still a few communities in the State of Pennsylvania, who revere the memory and emulate the virtues of Schwenkfeld.

Mention has already been made of some of the *adversaries of the Trinity*. Among the early Reformers, who rigorously adhered to the ancient symbols, such as opposed this dogma

[1] He explained the words of Consecration in the following manner: "Quod ipse panis fractus est corpori esurienti, nempe cibus, hoc est corpus meum, *cibus scilicet esurienti animarum.*"

[2] Cf. *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 711–714.

Hosted by Google

were punished with death.[1] *Campanus*, for denying the divinity of the Holy Ghost and holding Arian views concerning the Son, was cast into prison at Cleves, where he died about the year 1578. His followers fled to Poland, the common refuge of all heretical sectaries. For a time they remained in retirement, under the generic appellation of *Dissidents*, but about the year 1563 they formed a separate organization, under the name of *Unitarians*, and, by the active assistance of the Polish noblemen, made Rakow their headquarters. Through the influence of *Blandrata*, a native of Piedmont and physician to the prince, they received public recognition in Transylvania. Christ they held to be only a man, but a man richly endowed by God; and to make Him an object of worship they denounced as an idolatrous act. This rationalistic tendency, *so strangely in contrast with the low estimate put upon reason by all the early Reformers*, was still more marked in the teaching of the two *Socinuses*.

Laelius Socinus,[2] a member of a noble family of Siena, unlike most of the Reformers, was a man of austere manners and retiring disposition, though not distinguished for eminent ability or profound thought. Educated among the Antitrinitarians of Italy, he early became a member of a debating club, formed at Vicenza, and composed of forty persons of tastes and beliefs akin to his own. After the breaking up of this club, which was really a propagandism of Antitrinitarian views, under the guise of a literary society, Laelius made a tour through France, England, Holland, Germany, and Poland, in the course of which he fell in with many transalpine Reformers. He finally settled down in Zürich, where he died in 1562, when only thirty-seven years of age. Laelius had made his nephew, *Faustus Socinus* († 1604), his literary heir, and the latter taking the writings of his uncle as a basis, drew out and threw into shape the doctrine of Unitarianism, thus giving to the *Unitarians* of Poland, where he resided (after 1579), a definite creed and a distinct religious organi-

[1] See § 321.

[2] *Trechsel*, Protestant Antitrinitarians before Faustus Socinus, Heidelberg, 1844, 2 vols. Cf. *Freiburg* Cyclop., s. v. Socin.

Hosted by Google

zation. From this time forth they took the name of *Socinians.*[1] The most eminent of their theological writers were *Lublinitzki*, *Moskorzowski*, *Wissowatzi*, *Przypkowski*, *Gaspar Schlichting*, and *John Louis Wolzoyen.*[2] Their doctrine, while professing to be purely biblical, was essentially rationalistic; and the few faint traces of the supernatural, which it at first contained, grew gradually dimmer, till in the sequel they wholly disappeared. It is fully set forth in the *Catechism of Rakow*, and may be briefly stated in the following propositions. The idea of a God, of things divine, and of the distinction between good and evil, comes to man through education and other *external* sources. Man's *likeness to God* consists in this, that he has dominion over the lower animals. One might naturally be led to infer that, starting with these principles, they would bow in humble submission to all the facts attested by the witnesses of Holy Writ; while, on the contrary, they frankly avowed that whatever is contrary to reason (meaning, of course, the reason of the Socinians) could not be accepted as revealed doctrine. *Inspiration*, properly so called, or that influence under which the words of Scripture were written, they held, conformably with their idea of the Holy Ghost, to be no more than an intelligent understanding, possessed by virtuous and upright men, such as those who composed the Holy Books, under the guidance of God, who guarded them against the introduction of errors in matters of grave importance. They held the *Father* of Jesus Christ to be *alone God.* Christ is a mere man, though begotten in a supernatural way by divine power. In consequence of this miraculous conception, He is called the Son of God. Before beginning His public ministry, Christ went up into Heaven, and received directly from the Father the Gospel, which He was commissioned to announce to mankind in the Father's name. As a reward for His obedience, He received, after His second ascension, dominion over the universe, and on this ac-

[1] *Sam. Fred. Lauterbach*, Ariano-Socinianismus olim in Polonia, or Origin and Extent of Arian Socinianism in Poland, Frcf. and Lps. 1725.

[2] *Bibliotheca* fratrum Polon., Irenop. (Amst.) 1658, 8 T., fol., Catech. Racov. (1609), ed. *Oeder*, Frcf. 1739. Cf. *Wissowatzius*, Religio rationalis, 1685, Amst. 1703.

Hosted by Google

count must be honored as *God-man*, with the same honor that is paid to God Himself. The work of the redemption of mankind He continues in Heaven by offering Himself up for them to His Father. Their reconciliation, however, is not effected by vicarious satisfaction, but by remission of sins. The *Holy Ghost*, they said, is not a divine Person, but an energy or power of the Godhead.

According to the Socinian *anthropology*, Adam was indeed by his nature liable to death; yet had he persevered in obedidience *he would not have died.* Original sin is the invention of theologians, by whom it was subsequently introduced into the Christian scheme. The effects of Adam's fall did not go beyond his own person, except in so far as it entailed the necessity of death upon his descendants. Man endeavors, by the aid of his natural powers, to live morally; these powers are then supplemented and perfected by Christ, whose life, inasmuch as it exemplifies the fruits of virtue, excites in man a desire of holy-living. *Justification* is a judgment of God, who graciously absolves from sin and releases from punishment those who by faith in Christ diligently observe the moral law. The *interior workings of grace* being thus discarded, they consistently held the *Sacraments* to be but external ceremonies. Baptism is no more than a form of initiation into the Christian community, and the Lord's Supper only an enduring commemoration of Christ's death. The long season of peace enjoyed by the Socinians was turned to good account by them in propagating their rationalistic system. They were at length vigorously opposed by the Jesuits, driven out of Rakow in 1638, and expelled from all Poland in 1658.

Observation.—Now that the origin and leading characteristics of Protestantism are known, the questions may be asked: What is its true *value?* What are the *results* it has produced? After what has been said, the reader will be tolerably capable of giving answers to these two questions. He will, however, find the subject more fully treated and viewed under different aspects in the works of *Robelot* and *Kerz*.[1] It is also handled very exhaustively

[1] *Robelot*, De l'influence de la réform. de Luther sur la croyance religieuse, 1822 (against Villers), German by Raess and Weiss, Mentz, 1823. (*Kerz*),

Hosted by Google

by *Döllinger*, who supports his statements by the avowals of Protestants themselves. The same subject has been taken up by *Perrone*, *Balmes*, and *Nicolas*, and by other writers, like *Villers*,[1] *Hagenbach*, *Schenkel*, and *Hundeshagen*, who have given their especial attention to Protestantism.[2] The points to be kept steadily in view in prosecuting this inquiry are: First, the relations of the new doctrine to many of the ancient heresies; and, second, their relations to the *Catholic Church*. Considered from the latter point of view, Protestantism may not only be regarded as a *heresy*, but as "*a framework into which all heresies may be fitted.*" Judged *politically*, Protestantism was the basis of the Religious Peace of Westphalia, by which it obtained *equal rights* with the Catholic Church; whereas, previously to the sixteenth century, heresy was held to be a political crime, punishable with death. It was with difficulty the *Popes* reconciled themselves to the changed condition of heretics. *Innocent X.* protested against the articles of the Peace of Westphalia, complaining that Protestants "had nearly everywhere been permitted the free exercise of their religion; that building-sites had been granted them for churches; and that, like Catholics, they had been declared eligible to public offices and trusts," whereas truth should have authority over error.

Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Ermeland, and Cardinal of the Roman Church, an able controversialist and a close and judicious observer of the events of his age, concisely sums up the *successive stages through which Protestantism*[3] *passes* from its first beginnings to its last results. "The reformatory zeal," he says, "of the enemies of the Church is, as a rule, first directed against what they call human ordinances, meaning feasts and fasts, the celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, and the like, by which, they pretend, she has been disfigured. They next demand the Chalice for the laity, and, when it is refused, proclaim that the Church and the Pope teach what is contrary to Holy Writ, since it is said, '*Drink ye all of this.*' They then take matters into their own hands, and, rejecting transubstantiation and the abiding Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, substitute for the one a *transient* Presence at the moment of reception, and for the other the theory of impanation. These doctrines once established, the Sacrifice and the Priesthood cease to have any meaning. Having gone so far in their apostasy, they feel no difficulty in advancing step by step till they push their assumptions to their last results, and end by blasphemously *denying* the mystery of *the Blessed Trinity* and the *Divinity of Christ*. Hence," he concludes, "men pay a poor compliment to their reason and judgment when, professing to be startled at the doctrines of the Antitrinitarians, they can see nothing to find fault with in the principles

---

The Spirit and Consequences of the Reformation, being a refutation of Villers, Mentz, 1823.

[1] *Villers*, Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la réformation de Luther, Paris, 1802, German by *Cramer* and *Henke*, Hamburg, 1828.

[2] See p. 298.

[3] Judicium et censura de judicio et censura Heidelbergensium Tigurinorumque ministrorum in *Hosii* opp., T. I., pp. 669–707.

Hosted by Google

of their forerunners, particularly the Calvinists. Either," he goes on to say, "get rid of all sects at once, or *tolerate them all equally*, that while one is being persecuted the others may not be strengthened and encouraged." The same writer, in exhorting the Poles to continue steadfast and loyal to the One Church, calls their attention to the dissensions and calamities which the Reformation was instrumental in bringing upon Germany, England, and France.

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 342. *Summary.*

The Catholic Church had been seriously threatened. It became now a matter of grave concern to heal the wounds she had received, and to ward off the blows directed against her by her enemies. The faith had been assailed and subjected to no end of misrepresentations. Whole nations had lapsed into error.

It was, first of all, necessary to define precisely *dogmas* that had been misrepresented and corrupted. Next, it was necessary to correct *abuses*, that were manifestly such, and to re-establish order on a new basis. All this was done; and the more imminent were the dangers by which the Church was threatened, the more visible were the manifestations of her power, and the more unquestionable the evidences of her greatness. According to ancient usage, she set the seal of authority upon her faith by the voice of *an ecumenical council.* It was subsequently developed and defended by *the splendid scientific labors of men* as learned as they were profound. Externally, the marvellous activity of the *Jesuits* produced the most gratifying results. Internally, *the older and the younger Religious Orders* rivaled each other in reviving spiritual life, and both put forth fresh energies in defense of the Old Church. Her losses from those who had lapsed into Protestantism were more than made up by the number of those brought into her fold in other parts of the world through the *heroic labors of her missionaries.* "The conquests of the Romish Church in the New World," says *Macaulay*, "more than compensated for its loss in the Old."

Such is a meager outline of the facts to be treated in this chapter, which covers one of the most momentous periods in the history of the Catholic Church.

Hosted by Google

§ 343. *The Ecumenical Council of Trent.*

Sarpi (P. Suave Pol.), Istoria del Conc. di Trento, Lond. 1619; translated into French, with historico-dogmatic notes, by *Courayer;* into German by *Winterer*, Mergentheim, 1840 sq., 4 vols. This Servite monk and theologian of the Republic of Venice wrote full of bad humor and in satirist fashion against the hierarchy, showing rather a tendency to Protestant principles. He was in part contradicted by the Jesuit *Pallavicini*, who afterward became cardinal, and far surpassed Sarpi in aptness of representation. Ist. del Concil. di Trento, Rom. 1652, 3 T., fol., illustrata con annotazioni da *Fr. Ant. Zaccaria*, Rome, 1833, 4 vols., 4 lat. redd. *Giottino*, Ant. 1673, 3 T., fol.; transl. in part by *Klitshe*, Augsb. 1835 sq., 3 vols. Cf. † *Brischar*, Criticism on the (historic and dogmatical) Controversies of *Sarpi* and *Pallavicini* in the History of the Council of Trent, Tüb. 1843 sq., 2 parts. (*le Plat*), Monuments pour servir à l'histoire du Conc. de Trente, 1781, 6 T., latin., Lovan. 1781 sq., 7 T., 4to. The protocols written by the secretary-general, *Masarelli*, giving the complete acts of this Council, and the printing of which was commenced in Rome by *Aug. Theiner*, appeared after the latter's death: Acta genuina SS. oecum. conc. Trid., etc., Zagrabiae (Agram), 1874, 2 T., 4to. The editing, however, has been done, in many instances, with little care, so that completeness and fidelity are questionable. *Th. Sickel* published "Documents in Austrian Archives, illustrating the Hist. of the Council of Trent," Vienna, 1871–1872, three divisions. Hereupon *Döllinger* published "Unprinted Documents, Diaries, touching the Hist. of the Council of Trent," Nördlingen, 1876, 2 vols. *Salig*, Complete History of the Counc. of Trent, Halle, 1741 sq., 3 vols., 4to. † *Goeshl*, Hist. Review of the Counc. of Trent, Ratisbon, 1840. *Wessenberg*, The Great Councils, Vols. 3 and 4; also "*The Catholic*," 1841, May and December nros. † *Rütjes*, Hist. of the Counc. of Trent, Münster, 1846. † *Werner*, Hist. of Polemic and Apologetic Lit., Vol. IV., pp. 386–579. Canones et decreta conc. Trid. 1567, 4to; ed. *Jod. le Plat*, Lov. 1779, 4to. *Gallemart*, in several editions, with references to cognate church-ordinances of earlier times; ed. stereotypa, Lps. 1842; latine et germanice, ed. *Smets*, Bielefeld, 1847; * edd. *Richter* et *Schulte*, cum declarat. conc. Trid. interpretum et resolution. thesauri sacr. congr. Conc., Lps. 1853. Cf. *Philipps'* Can. Law, Vol. IV., p. 463 sq.

At the opening of the sixteenth century the necessity of holding a council was deeply felt, and princes and nations were earnest in their appeals for its convocation. Abuses the most flagrant had crept into the Church, and the new teachings of the Reformers aggravated instead of correcting them. The very existence of the Church seemed threatened. Still the Popes hesitated. They called to mind the scenes at Basle, and did not care to see them re-enacted. The conditions were not favorable. All Christendom was more or less diseased, and it seemed impossible, amid the excitement of the age, to

Hosted by Google

furnish an adequate remedy. The means were wanting; there had been no adequate preparation for prompt and decisive action; and the dispositions of ecclesiastical bodies were not satisfactory. There were also external obstacles in the way, such as the wars between Charles V. and Francis I. during the pontificate of *Clement VII.* This Pope, however, carrying out the design of his predecessor, *Hadrian VI.*, entered actively upon the work of reform. He desired to effect a reformation first in the Roman clergy, and in the course of time to extend it to the clergy of the whole Church; and for this purpose he established a Congregation, placing at its head the distinguished Bishops of Verona and Carpentras, *Giberto* and *Sadolet.*[1] These delays had their advantages. They gave time for excitement to abate and passions to cool. To Protestants they gave a sufficient interval in which to reduce their teachings to a precise and compendious form, and, consequently, to Catholics a better opportunity to refute them.

Paul III. (1534–1549), the successor to Clement, was a member of the Farnese family, and an accomplished humanist. He at once set seriously to work to convoke a council.[2] That he was in earnest is proved by the fact that from the very beginning of his reign he raised no one to the dignity of the cardinalate who was not eminent for piety and learning. To such men he committed the work of reform in the Church and the task of framing a bull for the convocation of a council (May, 1537). Never, perhaps, was any ruler more accurately informed of the wants of his kingdom, or more frankly told of the shortcomings of his government.[3] He convoked the Council to meet at Mantua, and commanded the bishops of the Universal Church to attend in person, under pain of suspension. Plenipotentiaries would not be recognized.[4] The Protestants were also invited to be present, but declined.

[1] †**Kerker*, Church Reforms immediately before the Council of Trent (Tüb. Quart. 1859, pp. 3–56).

[2] *Raynald.* ad. an. 1534, nro. 2, and *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. III., c. 17, nro. 3.

[3] Cf. *Kerker*, l. c., p. 39–42.

[4] Only the *German* bishops afterward received a secret dispensation, "lest they might leave their flocks in the midst of wolves."

Hosted by Google

It was then transferred to *Vicenza*, but with no better results. It was finally opened at *Trent*, December 3, 1545, by the Pope's Legates, *del Monte*, *Cervino*, and *Pole*.[1] There were present four archbishops, twenty bishops, five generals of Religious Orders, Pighini, the auditor of the Roman Rota, the deputies of the emperor, and those of Ferdinand, King of the Romans. The heart of the Pontiff was gladdened when his Legate, Cardinal Pole, wrote to him from Trent: "The doors of the Council are flung open; the reproach of barrenness is removed from the Church, as of old from Rachel. We pray that abundant measures of Divine grace may be poured down upon us, and that we may be able with the same prophet to invite all to come and be satiated at her breasts." The Protestants had expressed a preference that the Council should be held in a German city, and now that their wish had been complied with, they persistently refused to attend. While the Council was in session, they also received three distinct invitations to be present, all of which they declined.[2]

[1] Cardinal *Manning*, in the March number of the "*Nineteenth Century*" (1877), gives the following summary of the fortunes of the Council of Trent. The Council of Trent "was convoked in 1536, to meet at Mantua in May of the following year. It was then, by reason of opposition, prorogued till November, 1537. Then it was deferred till May, 1538, to meet at Vicenza. So few bishops came, by reason of war and of the disturbed state of Europe and of Italy, that the Pope, weary of proroguing, suspended the Council indefinitely. The Turks were still victorious, and Germany was every day losing its faith. Paul the Third, therefore, without the assent of princes, convoked the Council to meet in November, 1542, in the city of Trent. Three legates went to Trent, and waited many months for the bishops, who were still unable to attend, by reason of war and the dangers of travel. The Council was again suspended till a more favorable time. After three years, it was again fixed for March, 1545. After this came another delay; and the Council opened in April following. After fifteen months it was transferred to Bologna, where the bishops were so few that no decree was made; and, after five months, it was again indefinitely prorogued. It was then suspended for four years. Under Julius the Third, it began once more in Trent in May, 1551. It sat for a year; then, in April, 1542, it was suspended for two years, but the tumults of the world were such that it remained suspended for ten. In January, 1562, it was opened again. In December, 1563, the First Legate dismissed the bishops to their homes; and in January, 1564, Pius the Fourth, by the bull *Benedictus Deus*, confirmed the work of the Council of Trent." (Tr.)

[2] See pp. 125 sq.

Hosted by Google

On account of the small number of bishops present, the time was at first occupied in making the necessary preparations for holding "*The Holy Ecumenical Council.*" The work to be done by it was indicated. It embraced "*the propagation of the faith; the elevation of the Christian religion; the uprooting of heresies; the restoration of peace; the reformation of the clergy and Christian people; and the overthrow of the enemies of the Christian name.*"

Following the precedents of earlier councils, the Fathers decided that *congregations* composed of theologians and canonists should prepare *in advance* the subjects to which the Council proposed to give its attention. These were then submitted to *a General Congregation* of bishops, *once or oftener*, as the case required. This Congregation framed, discussed, and voted upon the decrees, which, when adopted, were announced in *public session* as the result of their deliberations. The voting was done, not by nations, as at Constance, but by the individual voices of those actually present, according to the usage of more ancient councils. The generals of Religious Orders were each entitled to a vote, while only one was allowed to every three abbots. There was at first a *difference* of opinion as to whether doctrine or discipline should have precedence in the deliberations of the Council. Some said *that a better impression would be made upon heretics, if they saw both the clergy and the laity of the Catholic Church faithfully fulfilling the law of Christ;* while others contended *that unless the truths of religion were first established, the lives of Catholics would be open to censure, inasmuch as their doctrines were claimed to be either false or corrupted.* After an animated discussion, a middle course was wisely adopted,[1] and at most of the Sessions two decrees

[1] Owing to remonstrances, on the part of those in authority, for which it seems difficult to find any adequate justification, the *routine* of the Council was not allowed to be made public until recently; and, when at last an account of it did appear, it was greatly disfigured by the malevolent misrepresentations and ignorance of hostile parties. *Friedrich*, Ordo et modus in celebratione sacri et oecumenici concilii Tridentini observatus. An extract from the Codex latinus 813 of the Royal Public Library of Munich, as compared with the routine of the *Vatican* Council, 1869–1870, in his Documenta ad illust. Concilium Vatic., Section I., Noerdling. 1871. Later: *Routine of the Counc. of Trent*, from a MS. of the Vatican archives, edited completely for the first

Hosted by Google

were published, one on doctrine and another on *discipline* (*de reformatione*). The decrees on *doctrine* are first stated at length in the form of *chapters*, and then, more briefly, in the form of *canons*. The specific work for which the Council had assembled was not reached until the *Fourth Session*, held April 8, 1546. In view of the arbitrary way in which Protestants had dealt with the Scriptures, accepting some portions of them and rejecting others, the Fathers in this Session drew up and decided upon the *Canon of the Bible*, in the drafting of which they conformed to those of the Councils of Hippo (393), Carthage (397), and Trullo (680). Of all the Latin *versions* then in use, they declared the *Vulgate* to be the *authentic* one; or, in other words, that, in whatever relates to faith and morals, it is in substantial agreement with the original text. They further showed *the relation of Holy Scripture to the teachings of the Church*, and *explained the rule of interpretation*. In putting an interpretation upon Holy Scripture, that one is to be chosen which is most in accord with the principles handed down in the Church from age to age.[1] Some regulations were also made concerning the editions of the Holy Bible.

In the *Fifth Session*, in which many points of the Church's doctrine on *original sin* came up for discussion, it was decreed that Adam, by his fall, *had deteriorated in both soul and body;* that the effects of his fall had been transmitted by *propagation* to all his descendants; that these effects are wholly removed by the merits of Jesus Christ and *His grace in the Sacrament of Baptism;* that the *concupiscence*, which still lin-

time; Latin ed., Vienna, 1871; German edition, with a parallel drawn between the Counc. of Trent and that of the Vatican, 1871.

[1] Agreeing in substance with *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*, who flourished toward the end of the second century, and using almost the precise words of *Vincent of Lerins* in the fifth century (see Vol. I., pp. 409, 587), the Council of Trent ordained: "Ut nemo suae prudentiae innixus, *in rebus fidei et morum*—sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione scripturarum sacrarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam sacram scripturam interpretari audeat." Cf. *Alzog*, Explicatio Catholicor. systematis de interpretat. litterarum sacr., Monaster. 1835. *Friedlieb*, Scripture, Tradition, and Church Exegesis, Bresl. 1854.

Hosted by Google

gers in man, *is not in itself sinful;* that this decree has no reference to the Blessed Virgin; and that the decrees of Sixtus IV. relating to her are in no wise impaired. The *decree on reformation* had reference to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, to the encouragement of the liberal arts, and to the preaching of the Gospel. It was ordained that all archbishops, bishops, and other prelates should preach, either in person or by substitute; from which it is evident that the Council was not only fully aware of the source of the growing evils, but fearlessly struck at their very root.

The *Sixth Session*, held January 13, 1547, issued a decree on *justification*,[1] which is a perfect model of doctrinal exposition, discards heretical errors, and is remarkable for the luminous precision of its language.

[1] Against *Luther's* doctrine on justification (see § 340), "justificatio" is defined as the "translatio ab eo statu, in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adae, in statum gratiae et adoptionis filiorum Dei per secundum Adam Jesum Christum, salvatorem nostrum." More explicitly it is then described as non solum (abolitio) remissio peccatorum, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiae et donorum (1 Corinth., vi. 11; Tit. iii. 5–7). The relation of *faith* to justification is determined thus: "Fides et humanae salutis *inittum, fundamentum et radix omnis justificationis*, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo et ad filiorum ejus consortium venire" (Sess. VI., cap. 8), which is directly against *Luther*, who maintained that faith is the "fastigium omnis justificationis."

The doctrine of *imputative* justice, invented by Luther, and perfected by Calvin, is rejected by the Council thus: "Si quis magnum illud usque in finem perseverantiae donum se certo habiturum, absoluta et infallibili certitudine dixerit, *nisi hoc ex speciali revelatione* didicerit, anathemata sit." Sess. VI., can. 16. Cf. Caput 12. The views of Luther on the *liberty* of man, which are so many developments of his doctrine on justification, are condemned thus: "Si quis liberum hominis arbitrium post Adae peccatum amissum et extinctum esse dixerit; aut rem esse de solo titulo, immo titulum sine re, figmentum denique a satana invectum in ecclesiam: anathema sit." (Sess. VI., can. 5.) Luther's theory of the total helplessness and perverseness of paganism was emphatically discarded in these words: "Si quis dixerit, opera omnia, *quae ante justificationem fiunt*, quacumque ratione facta sint, *vere esse peccata*, vel odium Dei mereri; aut quanto vehementius quis nititur se disponere ad gratium, tanto eum gravius peccare: anathema sit." Agreeably to this canon, the regula VII. of the regulae decem de libris prohibitis against Luther and others, favored the heathen classics, stating: "Antiqui vero ab ethnicis conscripti libri propter sermonis elegantiam et proprietatem permittuntur; nulla tamen ratione *pueris* praelegendi sunt." The last words, according to the context, refer to "libri, qui res lascivas seu obscoenas ex professo tractant, narrant aut docent, etc."

Hosted by Google

The *decrees on reformation* enforce the duty of episcopal residence and the visitation of churches.

The decrees of the *Seventh Session*, by logical sequence, pass on to the consideration of the doctrine of the *Sacraments* in general,[1] and of *Baptism* and *Confirmation* in particular.

The *decree on reformation* forbids the holding of incompatible benefices, and ordains that they can not be legally taken possession of until after the candidates have proved their fitness by a rigid examination, except in instances in which the appointments have been made by universities.

The Council had thus far done its work in peace, but unfortunately at this stage of its proceedings its progress was interrupted by the unfriendly relations of the Pope and the Emperor Charles V. By the victory of Muehlberg, the emperor had dissolved the League of Smalkald. Fearing that Charles would now employ his newly-strengthened authority against the Church, and desiring to have the Council at a more convenient distance from Rome, he transferred it from Trent to *Bologna*. There was also another reason for the transference. Trent was menaced with a terrible pestilence, the presence of which, according to the testimony of physicians, was already indicated by unmistakable signs.

In the *Eighth Session* (March 11, 1547), a majority of the bishops expressed themselves in favor of the change, and at once set out for Bologna. Here the continuation of the work of the Council was prevented by the opposition of the emperor and the bishops in his interest, and, after two unimportant Sessions, the Pope ordered Cardinal *del Monte* to dismiss the Fathers. Before they could be again called together, Paul III. died.[2] The abilities and other admirable qualities of the Pope were marred by his unseemly nepotism.

His successor, *Julius III.* (del Monte, 1550–1555), had taken

[1] "Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novae legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam *septem*, videlicet baptismum, confirmationem, etc., aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum: anathema sit.—Si quis dixerit, ea ipsa nova legis sacramenta a sacramentis antiquae legis non differre, nisi quia ceremoniae sunt aliae, et alii ritus externi: anathema sit." (Sess. VII., can. 1 and 2.)

[2] *Quirini*, Imago opt. Pontif. expressa in gestis Paul III., Brix. 1745.

Hosted by Google

an oath in Conclave to immediately convoke the Council, and as the emperor seemed favorable to the project, its sessions were again opened at Trent in May, 1551.

On account of a quarrel existing between the Pope and *Henry II.*, King of France, concerning the Duchy of Parma, the latter forbade the French bishops to go to Trent. Nevertheless, the business of the Council went on.

The *Eleventh* and *Twelfth Sessions* (May 1 and September 1, 1551), were merely preparatory to succeeding ones; and in the *Thirteenth Session* (October 11th), the all-important question of the *Eucharist* was taken up. It was defined that, after the act of consecration, Christ is *really*, *truly*, and *substantially* present in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the forms of bread and wine, in His Divinity and in His Humanity; that He is received in Holy Communion, not only *spiritually*, but *sacramentally* and *really;* and that He is to be set up in the remonstrance for the adoration of the people.[1] The Fathers gave no attention at all to the quarrel between the Franciscans and Dominicans as to the mode of Christ's Presence, whether It is by *production* or *adduction*.[2]

The *decree on reformation* speaks of canonical correction and the reformation of the clergy. The rights of bishops were also defined, and it was determined that no appeal should be taken from an episcopal to a higher tribunal before the final decision of the former had been given. A form of a *safe-conduct* was also drawn up for the use of such Protestants as wished to visit the Council; but it was declined by them as unsatisfactory. In the *Fourteenth Session* the doctrine of the Sacraments of *Penance*[3] and *Extreme Unc-*

[1] Sess. XIII., can. 1: "Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimae eucharistiae sacramento contineri *vere, realiter* et *substantialiter* Corpus et Sanguinem, *una cum anima et divinitate* Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde *totum* Christum; sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in *signo* vel figura, aut *virtute:* anathema sit." It is easily seen that the marked term *vere* is directed against the Eucharistic doctrine of *Zwinglius, realiter* against *Luther* and *Calvin*, who denied the *objective* reality of Christ's presence, and *substantialiter* against Calvin.

[2] See Vol. II., p. 781, note 1.

[3] "Si quis dixerit, in catholica ecclesia *poenitentiam non esse vere et proprie sacramentum* pro fidelibus, quoties post Baptismum in peccata labuntur, ipsi

Hosted by Google

tion[1] was defined. The *decree on reformation* speaks of the manner of life becoming the clergy, the conferring of Holy Orders, the jurisdiction of bishops, and other subjects of a cognate nature.

In the *Fifteenth Session* (January 25, 1552), the Fathers prolonging the proceedings, out of consideration for many Protestant States and princes, who had signified their intention to send theologians to the Council,[2] drew up another safe-conduct, more explicit in form than the preceding one; but this also was declined as unsatisfactory. It was objected by the Protestants that it did not grant their theologians the right to vote; that it barred any discussion of questions already settled; that it did not recognize the Bible as the only source of faith; that it held the Pope to be above the Council, and not subject to its rulings; and that it contained a refusal to release the bishops from their oaths of obedience.

After many ineffectual efforts had been made to bring about an understanding, the perfidious conduct of Maurice of Saxony, who, betraying the emperor, hastily occupied the defiles of the Tyrol, necessitated the suspension of the Council in its *Sixteenth Session*. Before breaking up, the Fathers mutually agreed to assemble again at the expiration of two years. Nine years, however, went by before the Council again assembled, and in the meantime the Religious Peace of Augsburg had been concluded (1555). While these events were transpiring, Julius III. and his worthy successor, *Marcellus II.*, whose elevation to the Chair of St. Peter was hailed as the return of the golden age of the Church,[3] went to their reward.

Deo reconciliandis a Christo Dom. nostro institutum: anathema sit." (Sess. XIV. de poenit., can. 1. Cf. cap. 1 and 2.)

[1] "Si quis dixerit, *Extremam Unctionem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum* a Christo Dom. nost. *institutum* et insinuatum (Marc. vi. 13) et a beato Jacobo Apostolo *promulgatum* et fidelibus commendatum (Jacob. v. 14, 15), sed ritum tantum acceptum a Patribus, aut figmentum humanum: anathema sit." (Sess. XIV. de sacram. extremae unct., can. 1. Cf. cap. I.)

[2] Cf. the work written before this time: *Alberti Pighii* Apologia indicti a Paulo III., Rom. Pontifice concilii adv. Lutheranae confoederationis rationes plerasque, Colon. 1538.

[3] *P. Polidori* de vita Marcelli II. commentar., Rom. 1744, 4to. The words of Cato were often applied to Marcellus (Cervini): "O te felicem, a quo nemo

Hosted by Google

The next successor to the Papacy was *Paul IV.* (Caraffa, 1555–1559), probably the least courtly and accomplished of the cardinals. He found himself at once engaged in a dispute with the emperor concerning the kingdom of Naples.[1] He had also the mortification to see his authority disregarded in the matter of the abdication of Charles V., and the elevation of his brother, *Ferdinand*, to the Imperial throne; and from that day to this the crowning of an emperor at Rome has not so much as been thought of. The *Duke of Alva* appeared before the walls of Rome, and threatened the city with the same disasters that had come upon it in the year 1527.

In the early days of his reign the conduct of the Pope had been open to the charge of nepotism; and when, later on, he changed his policy, and proceeded with considerable severity against laxity in morals, the designs of his relatives, and the insubordination of the subjects of the States of the Church, the people rose in rebellion against him. By the bull "*Cum ex apostolatus officio*" he made an ineffectual attempt to restore the Papal prerogatives of the Middle Ages.

Pius IV. (1559–1565) confirmed the title of *Ferdinand I. to the Imperial Crown*, and on the 29th of November, 1560,[2] again convoked the Council. On the previous 3d of June he had declared in the College of Cardinals his wish to have the Council meet, in the following words: "We desire the assembling of the Council. Did we not desire it, we should be left to struggle on against difficulties, which it is our wish to remove. The Council shall reform whatever there is to be reformed, even it be *our own* person and *our own* affairs. If we have any other thought than to serve God, may His punishment come upon us." The Council was again opened at Trent; although the Protestants, without any sufficient reason,

audet quidquam inhonestum petere!" He was, besides, a very learned man. Only *Sarpi* attempts to make him an astrologer, but is ably refuted by *Pallavicini*.

[1] *A. Carraccioli*, Collect. hist. de vita Pauli IV., Col. 1612, 4to. *F. Magii* disquis. de Paul. IV. inculpata vita, Neap. 1672, fol. *Bromata*, Storia di Paolo IV., Rom. 1748, 2 T., 4to. *Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. III., Pt. II., pp. 513, sq.

[2] Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, translated by *J. Waterworth*, p. 131, N. Y. and Lond. 1848. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

had demanded that it should convene in some city nearer Germany. The Papal Legate *Hercules Gonzaga*, who was appointed to preside, came attended by a number of cardinals, of whom *Stanislaus Hosius*, Bishop of Ermeland, was the most distinguished. At the opening of the *Seventeenth Session* one hundred and twelve Fathers were present. *This and all the other Sessions to the Twentieth*, inclusive, were engaged in *preparatory work*. In the *Eighteenth Session* a third safe-conduct was drawn up, containing concessions the most ample, and addressed, not only to the Germans, but to the deputies of the other nations. All were called upon by the tender mercies of God to help in bringing about harmony and reconciliation; to practice charity, which is the bond of perfection; and to bear within their breasts the peace of Christ, which gladdens the heart.

In the *Twenty-first Session* a decree was published on Communion under both kinds and on the Communion of little children. On the first point the Council reaffirmed the decisions of Basle, stating that Communion under one kind is sufficient, but that as time goes on and circumstances require, the Church may introduce changes in the administration of the Sacraments, without affecting their substance. On the second point it was declared that Communion was not necessary to the salvation of little children. The *decree on reformation* speaks more or less in detail of the various duties of episcopal administration.

In the *Twenty-second Session*, which treats of the *Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, the Eucharist is declared to be "*verum, proprium, et propitiatorium sacrificium.*" The sublimity which characterizes the decisions relating to the Eucharist is in admirable harmony with the surpassing grandeur of the subject. The Council expresses a wish that all persons present would receive Holy Communion at the daily Masses, and also approves of the celebration of private Masses. The decision of the question on the *use of the Cup by the laity*, after a prolonged discussion, was referred to the Pope, who, at the instance of Charles Borromeo, and quite contrary to the general opinion of the Fathers at the close of the debate, expressed himself favorable to the concession. In an affectionate brief,

Hosted by Google

addressed to several bishops of Bavaria and Austria, he gave permission to distribute Holy Communion to the laity under *both* kinds. This permission, which was granted only for the sake of making a trial, was, after a short time, voluntarily surrendered by the laity themselves, owing to the many inconveniences attending the practice.[1]

The *decree on reformation* repeatedly reminds the clergy of the dignity of their high calling, exhorting them to lead a life in every way in keeping with it; urges the necessity of conferring canonries on worthy candidates; and insists on the conscientious administration of church property.

In the sittings preparatory to the *Twenty-third Session* a warm and animated discussion took place on the question of the *divine institution* of the episcopate. This gave occasion to the revival of the old controversy on the superiority of an Ecumenical Council to the Pope, between the Italian and Spanish bishops on the one side, and the lately arrived French bishops on the other.[2] The principles of the Roman school were earnestly and eloquently defended by the Italians, who maintained that the mission and jurisdiction of bishops are derived *solely from the authority of the Roman Pontiff*. Their efforts, however, to have their views adopted were unsuccessful. The Pope had instructed his Legates to guard the rights of the Holy See in the event of the Council taking up the question of the whole hierarchy of the Church. They were to see to it, not only that the Pope should receive separate and distinct mention as the Head of the Universal Church, but that his prerogatives should be enumerated in the words of the *Council of Florence*, and that they should not tolerate the statements there made to be in any wise enfeebled. But learning the conflicting opinions of the Fathers, Pius sent word that he would be content if no decision at all were ex-

[1] Cf. *Pallavicini*, lib. XXIV., toward the end. *Dieringer*, Charles Borromeo, Cologne, 1846, pp. 172 sq. *Buchholtz*, Hist. of Ferd., Vol. VIII., p. 660.

[2] *Pallavicini*, Hist. conc. Trid., lib. XIX., cap. 5, nro. 5, informs us that the bishop, *Melchior Avosmediano* of Cadiz, was interrupted on the 1st of December, 1562, in an unbecoming manner: Quidam studio sive immoderato sive affectato conclamarunt—*dimittatur—anathema—comburatur, haereticus est* (cf. nro. 8). Alii conati sunt aut pedum supplosione aut sibilo eum impedire.

Hosted by Google

pressed, whether concerning the authority of a bishop or of his own. Under any circumstances, no definition should be proclaimed that *had not the unanimous consent of the Fathers* (*unanimi consensu*). The *Cardinal of Lorraine* (Guise) expressed himself in favor of this course as at once moderate and conciliatory. "The true prosperity of the Holy See," said he, "depends not on this or that little word, which may more forcibly express its prerogatives, but on the obedience of nations and the peace of Christendom." He also expressed a wish that in those troubled times the Holy See would be content with its acknowledged authority and importance, without requiring them to be set forth in any more precise and explicit declarations. For himself, he said, he would submit his own judgment in the matter to that of the Pope and the authority of the Church.[1] The question of a definition on this point was then waived, and after the *eight canons*, condemnatory of the false doctrines on the Sacrament of Holy Orders, it was merely added that "if any one say that the bishops, appointed by authority of the Roman Pontiff, are not true and lawful bishops, but of human institution, let him be anathema." As the *Pope's supremacy* had been virtually declared in a preceding Session,[2] this definition was accepted as sufficient.

The question as to *whether the duty of residence was binding upon bishops by human or divine law* was also warmly discussed, but finally dismissed without a formal definition. The *decree on reformation* (chap. I.), however, states that, "whereas, it is by divine precept enjoined on all, to whom the cure of souls is committed, to know their own sheep; to offer sacrifice for them; and by preaching of the divine word, by the adminis-

[1] Cf. *Pallavicini*, l. c., lib. XIX., c. 8, nro. 6, toward the end; cap. 15, nro. 3, at the end; cap. 16, nros. 6 and 9, toward the end.

[2] Sess. XIV., cap. VII., de Poenitentia: Ss. patribus visum est, ut atrociora quaedam et graviora crimina non a quibusvis, sed a summis duntaxat sacerdotibus absolverentur: unde merito *pontifices maximi pro summa potestate sibi in ecclesia universa tradita* causas aliquas criminum graviores suo potuerunt peculiari judicio reservare. Confer with this: Postremo sancta synodus (declarat), omnia et singula, quae sub Paulo III., ac Julio III. et Pio IV. in hoc sacro concilio statuta sunt, ita decreta fuisse, ut in his *salva semper auctoritas sedis apostolicae et sit et esse intelligatur.*

Hosted by Google

tration of the Sacraments, and by the example of all good works, to feed them;" and, whereas, these offices can not be performed by those who "abandon their flocks after the manner of hirelings; the Holy Synod admonishes and exhorts such that, mindful of the divine precepts, and *being patterns of their flocks*, they feed and rule in judgment and in truth." Therefore, all persons "set over cathedral churches are bound to personal residence," and may not be absent except when "Christian charity, urgent necessity, due obedience, and the evident utility of the Church or of the Commonwealth" demand it, and then only when "these causes are approved in writing by the most blessed Roman Pontiff, or by the metropolitan, or, in his absence, by the oldest suffragan bishop."

By these exciting discussions, the *Twenty-third Session*, which was to be public and solemn, was delayed till the 15th of July, 1563. There were present, besides the Papal Legates and the embassadors of the emperor; of the kings of France, Spain, and Portugal; of the Republic of Venice, and of the Duke of Savoy, two hundred and eight bishops, many abbots and generals of Religious orders, and a large number of doctors in theology. The doctrine, as set forth in this Session, concerning the Sacrament of *Holy Orders*, declares that there exists in the Catholic Church a *visible* priesthood, corresponding to the visible Sacrifice of the Eucharist; that this priesthood was instituted by Christ, and took the place of that of the Old Law; and that Christ gave to His Apostles and their successors the power of consecrating, offering up, and distributing His Body and Blood, as also that of forgiving and retaining sins. The Council further declared that, to the end that these functions might be more perfectly and worthily performed, the *hierarchical* degrees of major and minor Orders had been instituted, and that the *Sacrament* of Holy Orders sets an ineffaceable mark upon the soul of the recipient, insomuch that he who is once a priest can never cease to be such; and that, therefore, it shall not be lawful for any one to say that this Sacrament and the ceremonies by which it is conferred are useless and void of meaning.

The *decree on reformation* sets forth the duties of bishops

Hosted by Google

and cardinals regarding residence in the sense already described. Rules were next laid down *to be observed in the conferring of Orders*. It was also stated that such as had received priests' Orders should not administer the *Sacrament of Penance*, unless they possessed a benefice, to which was attached the cure of souls, or had been specially approved by the bishop for that office. Pre-eminent importance was attached to the ordinance, in the Eighteenth Chapter, providing *for the erection of diocesan seminaries for clerics*. The founding of *Seminaria puerorum*, it was urged, was necessary, "because youth, unless it be rightly trained, is prone to follow after the pleasures of the world; and unless it be formed, from its tender years, unto piety and religion, before habits of vice have taken possession of the whole man, it never will perfectly, and without the greatest and well-nigh special help of Almighty God, persevere in ecclesiastical discipline."

The Fathers looked forward to the foundation of seminaries as productive of so much good that they freely declared that the passing of this ordinance, had the Council accomplished no other work, would amply reward them for their labors. The Pope was the first to carry out its provisions by founding the *Roman Seminary*, and thus inspired the other bishops by his example.

The *Twenty-fourth Session*, held November 11, 1563, treated the Sacrament of *Marriage* from a dogmatic point of view. In deference to the Venetian envoys, the actual condition of the Catholic Greeks was taken into account in the determination of this question, and, instead of directly defining *the absolute indissolubility of marriage*, the Seventh Canon puts the matter indirectly as follows: "If one say that the Church errs, in that she has taught and does teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony can not be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties, let him be anathema." The attitude of the Reformers, who had accused the Church of error on the question of marriage, rendered the above declaration necessary. It was also defined that the Church alone has the power to determine what are *the impediments dissolving marriage;* that any marriage, to be valid, must be

Hosted by Google

performed in presence of *the pastor of the contracting parties* and *two* witnesses; and that ecclesiastical judges are alone competent to take cognizance of matrimonial causes. It was found necessary, in order to prevent clandestine marriages, to oblige the contracting parties to appear with witnesses before their pastor. The impediments of *kindred* were reduced, and the necessity of caution insisted on in the case of vagrants coming up to be married. Concubinage was declared a heinous sin, and severe penalties were pronounced against those guilty of it; and the civil powers received a threatening admonition not to interfere with the freedom of marriage.

The *decree on reformation* speaks of the duties of those whose right it is to select candidates for bishoprics; embodies a request asking the Pope, for the future, to appoint the cardinals from *all* Christian nations; ordains that *diocesan synods* shall be held annually, and *provincial councils* every three years; prescribes the manner of making the *visitation of churches* and administering a diocese during a vacancy; points out once more the qualifications to be possessed by those who are to be raised to canonries or other dignities in cathedral churches; and, finally, gives instructions regulating the conferring of benefices, and restricts the possession of a number of them (*pluralitas beneficiorum*) by one person.

A general desire was now expressed to have the Council come to a close, and the Pope's illness, which was daily showing more alarming symptoms, influenced the more prudent of the Fathers to acquiesce in the common wish. With the *Twenty-fifth Session* (December 3, 1563), therefore, the Great Council ended its labors. The decrees of this Session had reference to *Purgatory*, and the *Veneration of Saints, Images, and Relics*.[1] The teaching of the Church on Indulgences was

[1] Concerning purgatory: Synodus docet *Purgatorium* esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari. Apud rudem vero populum difficiliores ac subtiliores quaestiones, quaeque ad aedificationem non faciunt,—a popularibus concionibus secludantur.—Ea quae ad curiositatem quandam, aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tanquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant Episcopi.

Concerning the *veneration of saints, images, and relics:* Mandat sancta synodus episcopis—ut juxta catholicae et apostolicae ecclesiae usum—fideles diligenter instruant, Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes orationes suas pro

Hosted by Google

given compendiously in an *appendix*. It is there stated that the Church has received of God *the power of granting indulgences*; that these indulgences are *salutary;* but that they must be sparingly granted, *lest, if they should be obtained with too great ease, the discipline of the Church might become enfeebled.*[1] More than this it was unnecessary to say, as Pope *Leo X.*, in a bull, published in the year 1518, had fully defined and explained the doctrine on indulgences; but the Fathers wisely resolved not to put the question aside altogether, lest it might be thought they wished to shirk the very question that had given occasion to the schism.

The *decree on reformation* provides for the thorough reform of whatever pertains to the cloister; counsels cardinals and prelates to have a becoming, but modest household; pronounces severe punishment against those guilty of concubinage; speaks of the uses of excommunication; returns once more to the subjects of episcopal visitation, the conferring of benefices, and the administration of church property; and, finally, remarks upon clerical exemptions and other kindred matters. It was also ordained that the Congregation, then engaged in preparing a *Catechism of the Council*, a new *Missal*, a *Breviary*, and an *Index of Forbidden Books*, should submit its work, when completed, to the Sovereign Pontiff, under whose special supervision it should be published.

Princes were called upon in the name of God to assist in

---

hominibus Deo offerre; bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo *per filium ejus J. Chr. D. n., qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est*, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere. Illos vero, qui negant, Sanctos invocandos esse—aut asserunt—invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi—impie sentire.

Imagines porro Christi, Deiparae virginis et aliorum sanctorum in templis praesertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam: *non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus* propter quam sint colendae; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel *quod fiducia ita imaginibus* sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quae in idolis spem suam collocabant; sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibitur, refertur ad prototypa, quae illae repraesentant. Pope *Urban VIII.*, in the year 1642, gave still more explicit regulations on the use of images in churches in his bull "Sacrosancta." Cf. *Aschbach's* Eccl. Encyclopaed., Vol. I., p. 738.

[1] "Ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur."

Hosted by Google

having the decrees accepted, and in having them carried into effect. They were also besought to give in their own persons an example of their faithful observance. Finally, the two hundred and fifty-five Fathers present, of whom four were Legates, not including two other cardinals, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, seven generals of Religious Orders, and seven abbots, subscribed the decrees of the Council, adding the words *subscripsi definiendo.* The thirty-five procurators, representing bishops, also subscribed, but with the addition *subscripsi judicando.*[1]

Of the German bishops only two, those of Constance and Brixen, were personally present; five others sent representatives. The Decrees of the Council were confirmed by Pius IV., who also caused a *Tridentine Profession of Faith* to be drawn up, which, he ordained, should be made, as an obligatory condition, by all those who might in future enter upon any ecclesiastical charge, or obtain any academic degree, and also by those who, renouncing Protestantism, should return to the Church.[2]

[1] Cf. on this point *Pallavicini*, l. c. lib. XXIV., c. 8, nros. 13 sq.

[2] We insert the profession in full because it contains a very masterly summary of the dogmas opposed to the new doctrines of Protestantism. "Ego N. firma fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula, quae continentur in Symbolo fidei, quo Sancta Rom. Ecclesia utitur, videlicit: Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, factorem coeli et terrae, visibilium omnium et invisibilium. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei Unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula, Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero: genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt, qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem, descendit de coelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto, ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est. Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas, et ascendit in coelum, sedit ad dexteram Patris, et iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos, cujus regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit, qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per Prophetas. Et unam sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum; et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi saeculi. Amen.

"Apostolicas et Ecclesiasticas *traditiones* reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiae observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto et amplector. Item sacram scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est

Hosted by Google

Still later on, under the pontificate of *Sixtus V.* (1588), a Congregation, the idea of which originated with Pius IV., was es-

judicare de vero sensu et *interpretatione sacrarum scripturarum*, admitto, nec ea unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor. Profiteor quoque, *septem esse vere et proprie Sacramenta* novae legis a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria, scilicet Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Poenitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem et Matrimonium, illaque gratiam conferre et ex his Baptismum, Confirmationem et Ordinem sine sacrilegio reiterari non posse. Receptos quoque et approbatos Ecclesiae Catholicae ritus in supradictorum omnium Sacramentorum solemni administratione recipio et admitto. Omnia et singula, quae de *peccato originali et de justificatione* in Sacrosancta Trid. Synodo definita et declarata fuerunt, amplector et recipio. Profiteor pariter in *Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium et propitiatorium sacrificium* pro vivis et defunctis, atque in sanctissimo *Eucharistiae Sacramento* esse *vere, realiter et substantialiter Corpus et Sanguinem* una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fierique conversionem totius substantiae panis in Corpus et totius substantiae vini in Sanguinem, quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia Transsubstantiationem appellat. Fateor etiam, *sub altera tantum specie* totum atque integrum Christum verumque Sacramentum sumi. Constanter teneo *Purgatorium esse*, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari. Similiter et *Sanctos, una cum Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse*, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas. Firmissime assero imagines Christi ac Deiparae semper Virginis, necnon aliorum Sanctorum habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam. *Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse* affirmo. Sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco; Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro. Caetera item omnia a sacris Canonibus et oecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue a sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita et declarata indubitanter recipio atque profiteor, simulque contraria omnia atque haereses quascumque ab Ecclesia damnatas et rejectas et anathematizatas ego pariter damno, rejicio et anathematizo. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in praesenti sponte profiteor et veraciter teneo, eandem integram et inviolatam usque ad extremum vitae spiritum constantissime, Deo adjuvante, retinere et confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel illis, quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri et praedicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem N. spondeo, voveo ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet et haec sancta Dei evangelia." Cf. *Liguori*, Explanations of the Dogmatic Decrees of the Holy Council of Trent, translated into German by *Hugues*. Ratisbon, 1845. *Nampon*, Investigations of the Doctrines of the Council of Trent, translated from the French, Ratisbon, 1854, 2 parts. *Clarus*, Tridentine Symbol of Faith Proved by the Scriptures, Reason and History, 2 vols. Schaffh. 1865 sq.

Hosted by Google

tablished, whose special office it was to interpret of the Council of Trent (*Interpretes Concilii Tridentini*).[1]

A very cursory examination of the Sessions of this celebrated Council will convince every fair-minded person that no former Synod ever handled so great a number of subjects with such marked ability, or defined so many doctrines with such precision and prudence. Men holding the extremest divergency of opinions met there as upon a common and neutral ground; exchanged views with one another, the conservatism of some correcting the extravagance of others; and the result was a doctrinal equilibrium, which gave the steadiness and mental rest so necessary to the religious intellect of that age.

Of the bishops who attended the Council, the Spaniards were distinguished for the critical acumen and ability which they displayed in harmonizing the points of apparent conflict between speculative theology and the facts of Church History. It is doubtful if a council assembled at the *present* day would have among its members as large a number of eminent men.[2] How calm, and yet how truly earnest and sincere is the zeal for *real reform* which distinguishes this Council! What happy changes, how large a measure of genuine progress, would now be before the world had the decrees been as faithfully executed and observed, as they were loyally conceived, and their realization ardently desired, by those holy representatives of the Catholic faith.

The Decrees of the Council, confirmed by a papal bull of the 6th of January, 1564, were at once received[3] without restriction in *Venice*, in the principal States of *Italy*, in *Portu-*

[1] Cf. *Zamboni*. De hujus congreg. institutione, privilegiis atque officio, in the praefatio ad collect. declarationum s. congreg. conc. quae a. 1812 sq. prodiit.

[2] The Venetian *Jerome Ragosini*, Bishop of Nazianzum in partibus and coadjutor of Famagosta, exaggerated nothing when in the beautiful valedictory which he delivered before the representatives of the Council, he said: "Ex omnium populorum ac nationum, in quibus catholicae religionis veritas agnoscitur, non solum Patres, sed et oratores habuimus. At quos viros? Si doctrinam spectemus, eruditissimos—si usum, peritissimos—si ingenia, perspicacissimos—si pietatem, religiosissimos—si vitam, innocentissimos."

[3] Cf. *Pallavicini*, l. c., lib. XXIV., c. 11 sq.

Hosted by Google

gal, and in *Poland;* in *Spain*, in *Naples*, and in the *Low Countries*, they were published by Philip II., who, however, added the qualification: "Without detriment to the royal prerogatives." As a rule, the promulgation was made through the medium of provincial synods, held for this special purpose in 1564, and measures were adopted for having the Decrees carried into execution. After the death of Ferdinand I., in 1564, they were published by *Maximilian II.*, in the States of the Empire; and received by the Catholic Princes of Germany at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1566.

In *France* the *dogmatic* Decrees were accepted without qualification; but those relating to discipline were introduced only after protracted delays, notwithstanding that the Pope and the bishops exerted all their influence in their favor. The decrees to which the greatest exception was taken related to *fines* and *imprisonment* inflicted at the discretion of ecclesiastical authority; to *dueling*, the penalties for which were visited not alone upon the duelists themselves, but also upon their seconds and those who came to witness the encounter (Sess. XXV., ch. 19); to *concubinage* and *adultery*; to those which made bishops amenable only to the Pope, etc.

There was also another cause of serious complaint, in that the Council had declared that the consent of the parents was not necessary to the valid marriage of their children, while by French law such consent was *absolutely* required.

§ 344. *Other Popes of this Epoch.*

Onofrio, Platina restitutus c. additione a Sixto IV.—Pium IV. Ven. 1562, 4. *Raynaldi* ann. *A. Theineri* continuat. Baronii annal. T. I–III.—*A. du Chesne*, Histoire des papes. Par. 1646, f. cont. (up to Paul V.) par Fr. du Chesne. Par. 1658. 2 T. f. *Ranke*, the Roman Pontiffs in the 16th and 17th centuries. 4th ed., Brl. 1854. 3 vols.[1] *Reumont*, Hist. of the City of Rome. Vol. III., pt. II., p. 534 sq. *Haas*, History of the Popes,.p. 541 sq. *Groene*, the History of the Popes, Vol. II., p. 322 sq.

Pius IV. raised his nephew, *Charles Borromeo*, to the dig-

[1] While this, like all the other productions of *Ranke*, possesses unusual merit, the animus of the writer is exhibited in numerous passages like the following: "Our fatherland (Germany) has acquired the undying fame of restoring

Hosted by Google

nity of the cardinalate, and there is no act of his whole pontificate that carried with it more blessings to the Church. He also left an example worthy of imitation by his successors in establishing permanently a Congregation, to which he assigned the special office of *interpreting and carrying into execution the decrees of the Council of Trent.*[1] He was succeeded by *Pius V.* (1566–1572), a member of the Order of St. Dominic. The piety and the zeal of this humble friar for the well-being of the Church, and his never-ceasing vigilance in keeping bishops to their duties, raised him so high in the esteem of the other members of the College of Cardinals, that when the papal throne fell vacant he was at once called to fill it.[2] He personally served the sick in the hospitals, and thus exhibited an illustrious example of humility; he enforced the decrees of Trent, with the powerful aid of Charles Borromeo, and thus achieved conquests the most glorious for the Church. To him is Christendom mainly indebted for the splendid victory gained at *Lepanto*, over the Turks, by Don John of Austria (1571). He also commanded that the bull "*In coena Domini*," should be publicly read on Maundy Thursday,[3] not only in Rome, but throughout all Christian countries. This bull, the provisions of which may be traced back in the rescripts of many popes, chiefly of the fifteenth century, to the pontificate of Urban V. (1363), in its original text, condemned and pronounced sentence of anathema upon heretics, brigands, and pirates; upon those who should interfere with the legitimate jurisdiction of bishops, lay imposts upon the Church without the Pope's consent, or bring criminal action against ecclesiastics; and upon such as should supply the Saracens or other enemies of the Christian name with arms, do violence to pil-

Christianity to a purer form than it possessed since the first centuries—*of discovering again the true religion.*" Vol. I., p. 129.

[1] *Leonardi* oratio de laudibus Pii IV. Pad. 1565.

[2] *Catena*, Vita del P. Pio V., Rom. 1586. 4to. *Gabutii* de vita Pii V., Rom. 1605, fol. (*Bolland.* acta SS. m. Maji, T. I. p. 616.) *Maffei*, Vita di S. Pio. Rom. 1712, 4to. *Bzovii* Pius V. Rom., 1672 fol. *Chiapponi*, Acta canoniz. P., Rom. 1720.

[3] Hence the name "*In coena Domini*," although the bull commences with the words: "Pastoralis Rom. Pontif. vigilantia," in the magnum bullarium T. II. p. 189. Cf. *Le Bret's* Pragmatic history of the bull in cœna Dom. Frkf. and Lps., 1769 sq., 4 vols., and the *Historico-political Papers*, Vol. XXI., p. 57–82.

Hosted by Google

grims, or seize the property of the Pope. It also *cut off Protestants from the communion of the Church*, and set forth a claim to the prerogatives enjoyed by the Church during the Middle Ages. Its publication was firmly opposed by many princes and even some bishops in their respective States and dioceses. There is no question that Pius V. had the very best intentions in taking these rigorous measures; but their only effect was to alienate the good-will of many, without working any results at all adequate to his aims. The last edition of this bull was published by authority of Urban VIII., in 1627, and its yearly proclamation suspended by Clement XIV., in 1770. Pius V. was beatified by Clement X., in 1672, and canonized by Clement XI.

Gregory XIII. (Hugo Buoncompagno, 1572–1585) succeeded to Pius V. That he was deeply versed in law and the natural sciences is amply attested by *the new edition, which he published, of Canon Law*,[1] and by his corrections of the *Julian Calendar* (1582), which had then become so faulty that it was ten days behind the true time according to the solar year. Gregory was also a lover of the fine arts and fond of magnificent displays, but in these things he had in view the gratification of no personal vanity, but only the good of the Church, and the interests of his subjects. Prompted by such motives, he founded, at Rome, *six colleges*, which were respectively for *the Irish, the Germans*,[2] *the Jews, the Greeks, the Maronites or Christians of Mount Lebanon, and the youth of Rome.* The latter was the one which until recently has been known as the Roman or Jesuit College (*Collegio al Gesu*), and contained twenty auditories and three hundred cells. He also established *nunciatures* at Lucerne in 1579, at Vienna in 1581, and at Cologne in 1582. This outline will give an imperfect idea of his labors in the interests of the Church.

Sixtus V. (Peretti, 1585–1590), Gregory's successor, was in

[1] *Ciappi*, Comp. delle attioni e. s. vita di Greg. XIII. Rom. (1591) 1596. 4to.

[2] *Cordara*, Historia collegii Germanici et Hungarici. Rom. 1770. 4to. p. 53 sq. The German college in Rome, its foundation and commencement (Historical and Political Papers of 1842. Vol. IX., p. 236 sq., 293 sq.)

Hosted by Google

early life a herdsman.[1] Having entered the Order of St. Francis, he gave proof of such extraordinary ability that in 1570 he was created cardinal. He concealed under a modest exterior and humble deportment unusual capacity for government. His firm, austere, and unbending character well-fitted him to be a pope such as the times required, when the Church had to contend against Protestant princes as perfidious in their professions as they were unscrupulous in carrying out their designs. Original in conception, he was indefatigable in exertion, and wielded an influence among his contemporaries which left a permanent impress upon the events of that age. His name is so intimately bound up with the traditions of the people that the modern historian experiences no little difficulty in sifting the historical from the mythical. The diplomatist, Baron von *Huebner*, in our own day, has probably furnished the best materials for arriving at a just appreciation of the character of this extraordinary man. None knew better than Sixtus how to profit by the circumstances of the times, and none could have displayed greater skill and tact in making the Catholic princes allies of the Holy See. He never rested until he had ridded the States of the Church of the brigands who infested them. The protector of the poor, he encouraged the industry and stimulated the activity of his subjects. By steadily adhering to the rule of raising only worthy persons to the higher ecclesiastical dignities he effectually suppressed the evil of nepotism in the College of Cardinals.

He built magnificent halls in the *Vatican Library*, which he filled with the most precious monuments of antiquity; he published a new edition of the Septuagint, and the new and *corrected* (though defective) *edition of the Vulgate*, promised by

[1] *Robardi*, Sixti V. gesta quinquennalia. Rom. 1590. 4to. *Leti*, Vita di Sisto V., Losanna, 1669. 2 T., then 3 T. French Par. 1702. 2 T. *Tempesti*, Storia della vita e geste di Sisto V., Rom. 1755. 2 T. 4to. Sixtus V. and his Times, by Lorenz, Mentz, 1852. *Ranke*, Popes, Vol. III., and *Historical* and *Political Papers*, Vol. IX., p. 235 sq., 293 sq. Baron von *Huebner* (embassador of Austria in Paris and Rome), Sixtus V., Germ. ed. by the author. Lps., 1871. 2 vols. (The original in French. Paris, 1870. 3 vols.) Bonn Theological Review. 1870, nros. 16, 17; 1871, nro. 4.

Hosted by Google

the Council of Trent; he reorganized the administration of public affairs by establishing *fifteen Congregations* (1588); he had the great obelisk *set up*, which Caligula had brought from Egypt to Rome; he completed the cupola of St. Peter's Church; he constructed the superb aqueduct on the Quirinal Hill (*Aqua Felice*) for supplying the city with abundance of pure water; and, finally he left to his successor a well-filled exchequer which furnished ample revenues for all the requirements of government.

Urban VII., *Gregory XIV.*, and *Innocent IX.*, the immediate successors to Sixtus, lived only long enough to have their names recorded in the catalogue of popes.

The reign of *Clement VIII.* (Aldobrandini of Florence, 1592–1605), was both longer and of greater importance. He had the happiness of reconciling Henry IV. of France to the Church, and of establishing peace between Austria and Spain by the Treaty of *Vervins*. He got possession of the Duchy of Ferrara, which on the extinction of the house of *Este*, reverted as a fief to the Holy See. By raising *Baronius*, *Tolet*, *Bellarmine*, *d'Ossat*, and *du Perron* to the cardinalate he showed that he knew how to appreciate learning and reward virtue. In 1592 he published a new *edition of the Vulgate*. Owing to over-haste the edition issued in the pontificate of Sixtus was found to be incorrect, and, in consequence, Clement had his thoroughly revised, and so perfect is it that since his time no emendations have been thought necessary. He also began a revision of the *Breviary*, and established the famous *Congregatio de Auxiliis*[1] for deciding questions arising out of the Dominican and Jesuit controversy on grace. By the publication of an impressive encyclical, addressed to the whole world, he attracted three millions of pilgrims to Rome on the occasion of the customary jubilee at the opening of the century.

Had not the intrigues of the Spanish party prevented it, the learned Cardinal Baronius would have succeeded to Clement. As it was, their votes elected Cardinal *Octavianus*

[1] Cf. *Schroedl*, in the Freiburg eccl. cyclopaed. Vol. II., pp. 786–794. Fr. trans., Vol. V., pp. 194–203.

Hosted by Google

Medici, of Florence, who was crowned taking the name of *Leo XI.* The hopes which the election of so considerable a personage inspired vanished with his death after a reign of twenty-seven days. He was succeeded by *Paul V.* (Borghese of Rome, 1605–1621) who had displayed uncommon diplomatic skill and ability in an embassy to Spain committed to him by Clement VIII.

He was learned, pious, skilled in the art of governing, and zealous for the reformation of the manners of the clergy. He contributed largely to the adornment of St. Peter's and other churches; introduced the Perpetual Adoration or Forty Hours' Devotion of the Blessed Sacrament; and left behind him an enduring reputation as an efficient and exemplary Pope, in spite of the complaint of some that in the matter of *legal technicality* he was unnecessarily exacting and punctilious.

His protracted quarrel with the Republic of *Venice* has given rise to much discussion and not a little adverse criticism. This State had prohibited the building of churches and hospitals *without its special authorization;* forbidden real estate or other immovable property to be conveyed by last will to ecclesiastics; and ordered offending members of the clergy to be cited before civil tribunals. Against these measures Paul protested. The Senate of the Republic refused to yield. As a consequence the Pope, after taking council with the cardinals, excommunicated the Doge, and laid the States under interdict (April 17, 1606). The Senate resisted, declaring the action of the Pope unjust, and prohibiting, under the severest penalties, the publication of the papal brief within the territories of Venice; but at the same time commanding that the usual divine services should not be discontinued. The bulk of the regular clergy, including Capuchins, Theatines, and Jesuits, withdrew from the territory of the Republic in obedience to the voice of the successor of Peter; the secular clergy remained, and continued to celebrate divine worship. To this civic contest was added another of a more spiritual character. *Paul Sarpi*, a Servite monk, professing to be a tenacious champion of what he was pleased to designate as the rights of the Republic, encouraged the people in their re-

Hosted by Google

sistance by impressing upon them, as he said, a true appreciation of their privileges. He was answered by *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, who maintained the cause of the Pope. Henry IV., now a zealous son of the Church, interposed his good offices and adjusted the dispute. The *Capuchins* and *Theatines* were again permitted to enter the Venetian States, but the *Jesuits* were commanded not to return.[1] Paul V. very properly forbade the English Catholics to take the Test Oath required of them under the pretext that they had been accomplices in the Gunpowder Plot. When the news reached him of the assassination of Henry IV. by Ravaillac, he was unable to control the manifestations of his sorrow.

Gregory XV. (Ludovisio of Bologna, a pupil of the Jesuits, 1621–1623) went from one ecclesiastical dignity to another until he finally reached the papal throne. He gave fine promise, and his future course was looked forward to with unusual interest. Neither did he disappoint those who put confidence in him. It was he who gave to papal elections the forms they have ever since preserved, ordaining that cardinals in casting their votes should not make known the person of their choice. To elect, a two-thirds vote is required. There are four modes of electing, viz: "*scrutiny*," or an examination of the votes deposited by the cardinals in a chalice placed upon the altar; "*access*," or the changing of a sufficient number of votes, which, when added to those already given for any candidate, will secure his election; "*compromise*," or the concurrent action of *all* the cardinals transferring their right of election to a committee of their own body; and, finally, "*quasi-inspiration*," [2] or a public and general movement in obedience to which the election of some particular candidate is carried by acclamation.

[1] A Survey of the Situation of Venice at the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century. (Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. XI., p. 129 sq.

[2] *Ingoli*, Caeremoniale ritus election. Rom. Pont. Rom. 1621. *Lunadoro*, Relazione della corte di Roma. Ed. 5. Rom. 1824. 2 T. 12mo. This work in an earlier edition by *Andrea Tosi*, trans. into Germ. by *Bertram*. Halle, 1771. †**Kopatsch*, Vacancy and Filling of the Apostolic See. Innsbr. 1843. *Zoepfel*, The Elections of Popes, and accompanying ceremonies, in their development from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. Goetting., 1872.

Hosted by Google

After the taking of Heidelberg in 1622, Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, to remunerate the Pope for subsidies contributed during a number of years, presented to the Vatican Library a large collection of works, and among them many ancient manuscripts,[1] from the library of the Elector Palatine. Gregory was chosen by Austria and Spain to arbitrate a dispute concerning the *Valteline*, in the country of the Grisons. He also established the Congregation of the Propaganda (*Congregatio de propaganda fide*), with a special view of bringing heretics back to the Church. Its scope, however, was subsequently extended, and through the influence exerted by it, missionary work of every kind received a fresh impulse. Finally, he honored the Society of Jesus and increased the consideration in which that body was already held by canonizing *Ignatius Loyola* and *Francis Xavier*, and declaring *Aloysius Gonzaga* beatified.

Urban VIII. (Barberini, 1623–1644) was Gregory's successor on the papal throne. He was an experienced statesman, an eminent scholar, and an elegant poet. His collection of Latin poems, hymns, and odes rank among the best literary productions of modern times. He bestowed upon the cardinals (1630) the title of eminence (*eminentissimus*); published (1643) for the use of the Universal Church a new and *amended edition of the Breviary;* enlarged the powers of the Congregation of the Propaganda, placing under its control the Urban College (*Collegium Urbanum*), which has since become so celebrated; and after the death, in 1626, of *Francis Maria*, the last Duke of the House of Rovere, united the duchy of Urbino to the States of the Church. He is charged with being too intent upon enriching the members of his family, and raising them to places of honor and distinction, thus exposing them to the hardships they endured under his successors.

The friends of Urban favored the election of *Innocent X.*

[1] *A. Theiner*, Donation of the Heidelberg Library to Pope Gregory XV., by Maximilian I. Munich, 1844. A small portion of the MSS. (mostly Greek) carried to Paris in the time of Napoleon I., were restored to Heidelberg in 1815. About eight hundred more, relating to the Middle Ages, were restored by the Pope in the shape of a present.

Hosted by Google

(Card. Pamphili of Rome, 1644–1655), believing that, since he had been raised to the cardinalate by that pope, he would now treat his relatives with consideration. Being utterly disappointed in their hopes, they exposed themselves by imprudent acts to just punishment, which occasionally was hardly distinguishable from persecution. A war, already threatened during the lifetime of Urban, now broke out and raged fiercely between Innocent and the Duke of Parma, the latter of whom was charged with causing the assassination of a bishop appointed against his will to the see of *Castro*. Papal troops assaulted and took the citadel of Castro, and the duchy of the same name was incorporated among the States of the Church. The Barberini were now summoned, for the first time, to give an account to the Papal Court of the revenues hitherto administered by them, and the result not being satisfactory, they were deprived of their offices, which passed into the hands of the relatives of Innocent, at whose instance the investigation was set on foot. Foreseeing the storm and wishing to escape it, the Barberini at the first outbreak of the persecution against them fled to France, and Innocent, to prevent a similar flight in future, published a bull forbidding any cardinal to leave the States of the Church without the authorization of the Pope. Through the friendly offices of the French government the fugitives were permitted to return and take possession of their estates. But apart from this family quarrel there was another and more serious subject of complaint against Innocent, namely, the influence which, it was well known, *Olympia Maldachina*, his brother's widow, exercised in the affairs of the Church.[1] While it is a fact, admitted on all hands, that his morals were above reproach, his conduct in this particular can not be wholly excused. Of his connection with the *Peace of Westphalia* an account will be given in § 356.

§ 345*a*. *The Papacy.*

In spite of the threats and assaults of the Protestants, who had sworn to bring about the fall of the Papacy, there was

[1] Even *Ranke*, The Roman Pontiffs, etc., 3d ed., Vol. III., in the Appendix, p. 242, says, concerning her supposed liaison with Innocent X., according to *Leti*,

Hosted by Google

still in Catholic countries a very considerable portion of the inhabitants who continued to regard the Holy See with reverence, and to respect its ancient authority. Among its ablest champions were the Jesuits, who, while advocating apparently opposite principles, such, for example, as "that all royal authority comes from the people," whence, like the leading Reformers, they concluded that certain circumstances might arise in which it would be lawful *to put a tyrant to death*,[1] were nevertheless the most skillful and powerful defenders of the political theocracy of the Middle Ages. Encouraged by these evidences of loyalty, *Urban VIII.* again put forth the claims of *Pius V.*, and gave to the bull "*In coena Domini*" its final form.[2] *Nunciatures* were established by the Popes in the most important cities of the Christian world, for the twofold purpose of protecting the rights of the Holy See, and regulating the affairs of the Church with greater ease and expedition. Of those appointed to bishoprics the Popes reserved to themselves the right of selecting some and of confirming all. As *Bellarmine*, *Mariana*, *Suarez*, and *Santarel*[3] had been the ablest advocates of the papal power, such as it existed in the Middle Ages, so were they now the most conspicuous defenders of the bull "*In coena Domini.*" They were opposed by *Paul Sarpi*, "*the theologian of the republic*" of Venice, and by *Edmond Richer*, the author of a history of the Ecumenical

Vita di Donna Olimpia Maldachina, 1666, "*that there is not a word of truth in the story.*"

[1] It seems to be taken for granted that only *Catholic* writers, like *Mariana*, *Santarel*, and *Boucher* (De justa Henrici III. abdicatione), have held that there may be circumstances in which the putting of a tyrant to death is justifiable. People seem wholly ignorant of the fact that *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and the Calvinist *Junius Brutus* held that oppressive sovereigns should be killed. An observation in point may be here quoted from *Hugo Grotius:* "Liber flagitiosissimus Boucheri de abdicatione Henrici III. non argumentis tantum, sed et verbis desumptus est, non ex Mariana aut Santarello, sed e *Junio Bruto*." Appendix de Antichr., Amst. 1641, p. 59.

[2] Bullar. Roman., T. IV., p. 118 sq. Cf. above, p. 361, note. 3,

[3] *Mariana*, De Rege et Regis institutione. Tolet. 1598. Germ. ed. by *Riedel*. Darmstadt, 1843. *Bellarminus*, De potestate Summi Pontif. in temporal. Rom. 1610. *Suarez*, Defensio fidei cath. adv. anglic. sectae error. Conimbr. 1613. *Santarel*, De haeresi et schismate.

Hosted by Google

Councils, who maintained the rights of bishops and national churches with equal ability and unfairness. The arguments of Sarpi were directed chiefly against the Jesuits, "for," said he, "to triumph over the Jesuits is to triumph over Rome, and Rome once overcome, religion will work out its own reformation." Richer publicly maintained that the *States General* are above the King, and that Jacques Clement, in assassinating Henry III. for not keeping his sworn promises, had justly avenged his country and his country's liberties. He was in consequence arrested and imprisoned, and did not obtain his liberty until after he had submitted his work, *De Ecclesia et politica potestate* (Paris, 1611), to the judgment of the Holy See (1629).

§ 345*b*. *The Secular and Regular Clergy.—Revival of Synods.*

Although the *College of Cardinals*, at the period of which we are now writing, included among its members some who were unworthy of their exalted position, having been raised to it because they chanced to be the nephews of popes, it also contained many more, distinguished for the purity of their faith, the extent of their learning, and the warmth of their zeal, who gave abundant proof of talent, prudence, and capacity in the legatine missions with which they were intrusted. The names of Cardinals *Cajetan*, *Pole*, *Contareni*, *del Monte*, *Cervini*, *Hosius*, and *Charles Borromeo*, of *Francis Commendone*, the Pope's Chamberlain, and Bishop *Delphini*, will at once occur to the mind of the reader. The last two named were sent to the Diet of Naumburg, in 1561, and by their energy and address, no less than by their forcible and polished eloquence, greatly embarrassed the action of the Protestant princes.[1]

Unfortunately the sloth, the perfidy, and the apostasy of *bishops*, secular clergy, and monks were only too frequently the occasion of shame and disaster to the Church. It was the complaint of Eck that the bishops of Germany gave more attention to temporal than to spiritual affairs, and the letter of

[1] Cf. *Pallavicini*, Hist. Conc. Trid., lib. XIII., ch. 7; lib. XV., ch. 2–6, and 8; lib. XXIV., ch. 13. **Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo, pp. 147–155.

Hosted by Google

the Elector Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, to Luther,[1] is ample proof that the complaint was just. It is a comfort to know that there is no other instance of so detestable a treason in so exalted a personage. As if to atone in some manner for the mischief and dishonor which this prelate brought upon the Church, *Jerome Scultetus*, Bishop of Brandenburg, and *Adolphus*, Bishop of Merseburg, carried the war into the very camp of the enemy, and in the theater of Luther's labors fearlessly proclaimed and triumphantly defended the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

The holding of *diocesan* and *provincial synods* was the most urgent need of the Church during this epoch, and Rome had only to blame her own centralizing policy for their interruption. Had they been regularly held, the Lutheran controversy in all probability would not have been brought before the Diets of the Empire for adjudication; the disorders of the clergy would certainly not have been so scandalous; and the religious instruction and moral training of the people would not have been so shamelessly neglected. The Councils of Basle and Lateran (V.) had already made earnest but ineffectual efforts to enforce the duty of holding *synods*, ordaining that the *diocesan* should be called *annually*, and the *provincial* every *three years*. Hence the Council of Trent, to remedy the evil, ordained (Sess. XXIV., *De reformatione*, c. 2) that provincial councils, wherever omitted, should be renewed and held every third year "for regulating morals, correcting excesses, settling controversies, and for other purposes allowed by the canons;" and that "diocesan synods shall also be held yearly."

Charles Borromeo was the first to carry out the decrees of Trent in his own diocese of Milan, and his example was followed by the bishops of every Catholic country, as the catalogue of the provincial councils of the epoch, to which reference will be made farther on, clearly shows. Unfortunately the practice of holding synods again ceased to be observed in nearly every country of Christendom toward the close of the eighteenth century in spite of the frequent and earnest ex-

[1] See §§ 276, 277, in Vol. II., pp. 926–931; and p. 14 of this volume.

Hosted by Google

hortations of Pope *Benedict XIV.*[1] The Council of Trent was equally solicitous in providing for the *formation of a new clergy* (Sess. XXIII., *De reformatione*, ch. 18). Seminaries for the instruction and training of clerics were to be erected in every diocese, and those intended for the service of the Church were to be entered while yet of a tender age.[2] "If the Catholic world has had for the last three hundred years," says Bishop *Hefele*, "a more learned, a more moral, and a more pious clergy, than that which existed in almost every country at the time of the so-called Reformation, and whose tepidity and faithlessness contributed largely to the growth of the schism, it is wholly due to the decree of the Council of Trent, and to it we in this age owe our thanks."[3] *St. Charles Borromeo* in Italy, and *St. Vincent de Paul* in France, as they were the first to carry this decree into effect, so were they the most earnest. As seminaries could not be established in Germany on account of the circumstances of the times, *St. Ignatius Loyola* founded in Rome the *German College* (*Collegium Germanicum*), for the education of the German clergy. The establishment was endowed and placed on a permanent basis by Gregory XIII.[4] Those that went out from this College were, as *Julius III.* expressed it, to become the fearless champions of the faith where it already existed, and its apostles where it was still to be introduced. In Germany itself, *Bartholomew Holzhauser*, who was born at Langenau, near Ulm, in 1613, and died at Bingen, in 1658, founded the *Institute of the Brothers of the Common Life*, for secular priests (*Collegium Fratrum in communi viventium*), in 1640, at Salzburg, whence it was introduced into the dioceses of Augsburg, Mentz, and Coire, and became a source of many and great blessings to Germany, particularly after the

[1] In his work *De Synodo Diœcesana*, where he also instructs bishops as to the character, object, and limits of these synods. Cf. *Phillips*, Diocesan Synods, p. 84 sq.

[2] Cf. *Freiburg*, Eccl. Cyclopaed., s. v. Seminary, Clerical, in Vol. X. Fr. trans., vol. 21, p. 479 sq.

[3] *Hefele*, The Vicissitudes of the Church since the Council of Trent. Tuebing. Quart. Review, nro. 1, p. 24 sq.

[4] See p. 362.

Hosted by Google

close of the devastating Thirty Years' War.[1] So marked was its success, and so popular did the Institute become, that it was soon introduced into Hungary, Spain, and Poland. *San Felice*, the Papal Nuncio at Cologne, characterized its statutes as a "*medulla canonum.*"

§ 346. *The Order of the Jesuits.*

Autobiography of St. Ignatius. (*Bolland.*, Acta ss. mens. Jul., T. VII., p. 409.) *Ribadeneira*, Vita Ignatii, libri V. Neap. 1572. (German, Ingolstadt, 1614.) *Maffei*, De vita et moribus Ignatii Loyolae. Rom. 1585. 4to. †**Genelli*, S. J., Life of St. Ignatius Loyola. Innsbruck, 1847. Constt. regulae, decreta congregationum, censurae et praecepta c. litteris Apostol. et privileg. (institutum S. J. ex decreto congreg. general. XIV. Prag. 1705. 2 V.) *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. III., p. 121 sq. Hist. S. J. a *Nicol. Orlandino*, *Sacchino*, *Juvencio*, etc., Rom. et Antv. 1615–1750. 6 T., fol. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., pp. 92–217. *Ribadeneira*, *Allegambe*, et *Sotwel.*, Bibl. scriptor. S. J. Antv. 1643. *Lagomarsini*, Testimonia viror. illustr. S. J. *Bartoli*, Hist. of the Order of Jesuits. Germ. Würzburg, 1845. *Crétineau-Joly*, Hist. of the Society of Jesus, from a religious, political, and literary point of view. 6 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1845–46. Germ. Vienna, 1845 sq. 5 vols. In the same spirit further developments of the Hist. of the Society of Jesus, by *Brühl*, 1846; by *Buss*, Mentz, 1853; by *Daurignac*, Germ. by *Clarus*, Ratisbon, 1864. 2 vols.

The Religious Orders, whose members were more numerous than the secular clergy, showed themselves utterly unequal to the task of grappling with the dangers that menaced the Church. Some, in whom the fire of charity had become extinct, remained passive spectators of the conflict; while others embraced the errors of the day, and passed over to the camp of the enemy. A committee appointed by Paul III. to examine and report upon the condition of the monks, gave it as their opinion, that the communities of those religious houses, in which discipline had become relaxed, and manners dissolute, should be allowed to die out, when others more zealous and honest might take their place. The secular clergy were no better than the monks, and the Church could not look to them for any effective assistance in the supreme hour of her trial. But while faith seemed extinct in the hearts of men consecrated to the special service of God, it was living, active, and energetic in the Church, producing, at

[1] *Gaduel*, Bartholomew Holzhauser. Tr. from the French into Germ., Mentz, 1862. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 634; Fr. tr., Vol. II., p. 365 sq.

Hosted by Google

this time, a new Religious Order, which, apparently growing out of the circumstances of the age, was, for this very reason, peculiarly fitted to minister to its needs. Specially designed to repel the advances of Protestantism, this Order has at all times filled the Protestant mind with vague and undefined terrors. Protestants, as a rule, have regarded the great Society as an enemy to the human race, formidable indeed, but deserving the execration of all good men; and even Catholics, while professing true allegiance to the Church, have judged it erroneously, and condemned it unjustly. To give a fair and faithful account of its origin and character is, therefore, now, perhaps more than in any age since its foundation, the duty of the historian.

Ignatius, the founder of this Society, was the descendant of a noble Spanish family, and was born at *Loyola*, in 1491. In his early life, he embraced the profession of arms, and was wounded at the siege of Pampeluna, in 1521, where he distinguished himself by his gallantry. During the long and weary season of his convalescence, having exhausted his stock of romances, he took to reading the Holy Scriptures and the Lives of the Saints, and, like St. Francis of Assisi, was inspired with the desire of conquering the happiness and glory of Heaven by enduring the contempt and the sufferings of the world. He made up his mind that as soon as he should be perfectly restored to health, he would enter upon a more austere manner of life, set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and there labor for the conversion of the infidel. Having gone to the Holy Land, he fell in, at Jerusalem, with the provincial of the Franciscans, who advised him to give up his design, which he did, and returned to Europe. It was at this time that the idea of founding a new Religious Order came up to his mind. To give it practical shape required more learning than he then possessed, but he was not ashamed to take his place on the benches with the children of the grammar-school, and begin to master the rudiments of Latin. He completed his academical studies at the Universities of *Alcalá*, *Salamanca*, and *Paris*. While at the last-named place, he prevailed upon some of his fellow students to adopt his austere mode of life, of whose transforming power his own experience at Manresa was sufficient evidence. These young men in turn helped him on in his

Hosted by Google

studies, and with their assistance he was enabled, in 1534, to pass creditably through a rigorous examination for the degree of Doctor. His principal associates were *Peter Lefèvre*, a Savoyard; *Francis Xavier*, a Navarrese; *James Lainez, Alphonsus Salmeron*, and *Nicholas Bobadilla*, all Spaniards; and a Portuguese named *Rodriguez*. Sometime later he was joined by *Lejay*, another Savoyard, *John Codure*, and *Pascal Broet*, the former a native Dauphiné, and the latter of Picardy. As their ideas matured, they gave a wider scope to their plans, and decided to devote themselves to the care of souls. Relinquishing for the time the Eastern project, Ignatius, accompanied by Lefèvre and Lainez, repaired to Rome, in 1539, and submitted the rule of the proposed new Order to Pope Paul III. Their vow, in addition to the threefold obligation of chastity, poverty, and obedience, included a fourth, by which they bound themselves, unconditionally, *to go as missionaries to any part of the world to which the Holy Father might please to send them.* From resolves so determined and motives so disinterested, Paul III. could not withhold his sanction, and he accordingly approved the "*Society of Jesus*"[1] in a bull dated September 27, 1540. The number of "professed" members to be admitted into the Society was at first limited to sixty; but learning the beneficial results of their early labors, Paul III. removed the restriction, March 14, 1543, and his successors granted them many and important privileges. The Society spread rapidly in Europe. *Peter Canisius*,[2] in Germany, became one of its members in 1543. Its spirit of charity and ardent zeal were carried beyond the seas by *Francis Xavier*.

The *Constitution of the Society*, more detailed, precise, and rigorous, than that of any of the older Orders,[3] may be given

[1] This appellation, which had in the fifteenth century been conferred by Pius II. on an order of chivalry, met with much opposition, and *Sixtus V.* ordered the General, Claudio de Acquaviva, to discontinue it. But before the order could be carried into effect Sixtus died, and the name was formally approved by *Gregory XIV.*, June 28, 1591. See *Genelli*, l. c., p. 190 sq.; also American Cyclopaed., art. *Jesuits*, by Rev. *B. O'Reilly*, S. J.

[2] *Riess*, S. J., Life of Blessed Peter Canisius, of the Society of Jesus. Freiburg, in Brisgovia, 1865.

[3] The Code of the Society comprises the following: 1st. *Examen generale*, containing a series of questions to be answered by applicants for admission;

Hosted by Google

in outline as follows: The specific aim of the Society is expressed in its motto "*Ad majoram Dei gloriam*"—*To God's greater glory*. Hence it is the duty of the members to labor for the salvation of others as well as their own. *The former* object they accomplish by conducting the spiritual exercises for priests in retreat; preaching missions to the laity; teaching catechism; hearing confessions; defending the faith against heretics; and, more than all, by instructing youth in *grammar-schools* and *colleges*; *the latter*, by interior prayer, examen of conscience, the reading of ascetical works, and frequent communion. To be received into the Society the applicants must be of sound body and well endowed with mental gifts.

Novices, after a short trial as postulants, spend *two* years in the *novitiate*, during which *all* studies are suspended, and nearly the whole time is passed in spiritual exercises, in order that, having gone through the various degrees of humility, they may be well prepared for a life of earnest study. Having finished the novitiate, they make their first or simple vows (*vota simplicia*), by which they take upon themselves the threefold obligations of poverty, chastity, and obedience, common to all Religious Orders; and formally promise to remain in the Society, and, at some future day, to accept any charge which the General, acting under the Constitution, may assign them. Their poverty consists in this, that they can not possess, either individually or collectively, property of any kind whatever, and must supply their wants from voluntary donations. But that teachers and students may not be distracted by constant solicitude for the necessaries of life, *colleges* are allowed to receive endowments. At the close of the novitiate, studies begin, consisting chiefly of the *languages*, *poetry*, *rhetoric*, *philosophy*, *mathematics*, and the *physical sciences*; and lasting through a period of five years. After a satisfactory examination, the young Jesuits are set to teach in the

2d. *Constitutiones*, describing the mode of community-life; 3d. *Regulae*, relating to the administration of the offices of the Society; 4th. *Declarationes*, or explanations of the text. The whole forms what is known as the *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, which, according to the declaration forming a sequel to the Constitution of 1558, was written by *St. Ignatius* himself and not by Lainez.

Hosted by Google

schools of the Society for five or six years. Beginning usually with the lowest, they pass on step by step until they have taught the highest branches. They are next sent to make their studies in *theology*, the course of which lasts four years, or six, if a more thorough acquaintance with the Fathers of the Church be desired. At the close of each half year they are made to stand a rigorous examination; and, when their theological studies are completed, they go up for *priest's Orders*. While engaged in these studies they are obliged to meditate and examine their consciences frequently; to receive Holy Communion every three days; and to renew their vows twice in the year. These devotions and regulations are deemed necessary to keep alive in the heart the spirit of true piety, and the better to enable the scholastics to perform them well the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius (*Exercitia spiritualia*)[1] are put into their hands. The conduct of each member of the Society is watched over by another, and no one is permitted to go from the house to which he is attached without a companion.

When the theological studies have been completed, the *second novitiate* is entered upon, which lasts a year, part of which is given to preaching, teaching catechism, and instructing; but the greater part to meditation and prayer, to the study of the Constitution of the Society, and to the cultivation of the different virtues. Finally, when these various stages of probation have been gone through, those who are judged worthy are admitted to make the second vows, and take their places among either the *Coadjutors* or the *Professed*.

The members of the Society are divided into three classes, according to their talents, their knowledge, and their piety,

[1] The exercises were first printed at Rome, and approved by Paul III. in 1548. An attempt at systemizing and explaining them is found in *Bellecii* Medulla asceseos seu exercitia S. P. Ign. accuratiori et menti ejus propriori methodo explanata, ed. *Westhoff*, Monast. 1845, 1848, and in *Manresa*, seu Exercitia S. Ignatii, Ratisbon, 1848; *Manrèse*, ou les Exercise spirituelles par S. Ignace Loyola, Brussels, 1854. *Manresa*, or the Spir. Exerc. of St. Ignatius, Baltimore, 1866; and A Spir. Retreat of Eight Days, by the *Right Rev. J. M. David*, ed. *M. J. Spalding*, Bp. of Louisville, ibid., 1864; Woodstock, 1876. A brief and spirited analysis of these exercises has been given us by *Père Ravignan*, de l'Institut des Jesuites (Germ. by *Reiching*, Schaffh. 1844, pp. 11–32).

Hosted by Google

viz: the *Professed*, the *Spiritual Coadjutors*, and the *Temporal Coadjutors*, or Lay Brothers (*Professi, coadjutores spirituales, coadjutores temporales*).

1. The *Professed* take, besides the three ordinary monastic vows, a *fourth*, by which they bind themselves to go unreservedly as missionaries wherever the Pope wishes to send them, and *no one but the Pope* can absolve them from their vows. From this class are taken the most important officers of the Society, such as the general, the provincials, professors of theology, and superiors of the various houses belonging to the Order. These establishments are the following: *Houses of Professed*, under the government of *Presidents; colleges*, requiring each at least thirteen members, under the government of a *rector; affiliated colleges* or *residences*, under the government of a *superior*, in which fathers of advanced age spend the close of their lives in quiet, or perfect any literary labors they may have in hand; and, finally, *mission houses*, intended to supply help to priests having cure of souls. The general holds his office for life, but the officers of inferior rank are elected every three years.

The *Monita Secreta*,[1] or Secret Instructions, which, it is said, were meant to be reserved solely for the Professed, and with whose odious and monstrous principles the Society has been so persistently and so unjustly assailed, are calumnious and apocryphal productions, published against the Jesuits by their enemies. Another calumny is the interpretation which some have put upon a certain passage in the Constitutions, which, it is claimed, *gives a superior the power to oblige the members to do evil* under certain circumstances. It would seem that no one could attach such a meaning to the words in question without *intentionally misapprehending* their true sense.[2]

[1] *Doller*, The Anti-Jesuit, being a Counterbuff to the Jesuits' Journal, 1817.

[2] The passage referred to (Pars VI., c. 5) runs as follows: "Visum est nobis in Domino, excepto expresso voto, quo societas summo Pontifici, pro tempore existenti, tenetur, ac tribus aliis essentialibus paupertatis, castitatis et obedientiae, nullas constitutiones, declarationes vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere, nisi Superior ea in nomine Domini J. Chr. vel in virtute obedientiae juberet." The title under which the words are found is: "Quod constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt." The meaning, it is quite evident, is this: "The four great vows bind at all

Hosted by Google

2. The *Coadjutors*, who make up the bulk of the Society, are engaged in teaching in the schools and in doing pastoral work. Of these the *Scholastics* (*Scholastici approbati*) are intrusted with the most advanced classes.

3. The *Temporal Coadjutors* (*Coadjutores temporales*), or Lay Brothers, to whom the manual and minor offices of the Society are assigned. In the exterior manner of life there is no distinction between the professed and the coadjutors.

Each province is presided over by a *provincial*, and the whole Society is governed by a *general*, who resides *at Rome*, and enjoys absolute power within the limits of the ancient laws of the Order. To make any change in the Rule requires the consent of the General Congregation. To avoid trouble and intrigues among the members, the provincials and the other superiors of the houses of the Society are appointed by the general. He is advised as to the fitness of the latter by the provincial and three other Jesuits. The superiors of the various houses are required to give an account yearly to the general of the conduct and talents of those under their care. The general has a council of *six assistants*, who are men of long experience and tried virtue. They are elected in the General Congregation, one from each of the six "assistancies" of Germany, France, Spain, Portugal,[1] Italy, and Poland. The general acts under the direction of the assistants, who, in extreme cases, may depose him, but the ordinary de-

times under guilt of sin; but the other constitutions and ordinances only when the superior commands, in virtue of Holy Obedience or in the name of Jesus Christ." Compared with the obligations enforced by *other* orders, this seems mild. It should seem that the conditions to be found scattered through the "*Declarationes*" ought to have rendered impossible so senseless and dishonest an interpretation. It is there stated over and over again that the superior is to be obeyed "in omnibus rebus *ubi peccatum non cernitur,—ubi definiri non possit aliquod peccati genus;*" and again, "hujusmodi illae omnes (declarationes) in quibus nullum manifestum est peccatum." Cf. *Riffel*, Suppression of the Order of the Jesuits, Mentz, 1845, pp. 217 sq. *Steitz*, The meaning of the mediaeval phrase "*obligare ad peccatum*" (to bind under sin), Annuary of Germ. Theol., Vol. IX., Gotha, 1864, pp. 148 sq. [*Very Rev. J. A. Corcoran, D. D.*, American Cath. Quart. Review for January, 1876, art. "Jesuits," pp. 69 sq. (Tr.)]

[1] The "assistancy" of Portugal was never revived after the suppression of the Order in that country. That of England has been lately created, and that of Poland has been merged into that of Germany. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

posing power is vested in the General Congregation. To the general is attached an *admonitor*, whose duty it is to comfort him as a friend, to watch over him as a father, and to act as his confessor.

It is no wonder that a Society like this, the very perfection of a strongly organized *constitutional monarchy*, of wise legislation and prudent administration, should rise to great power, and exert a marvelous influence upon mankind. This was the necessary result of its perfect organization and the courageous spirit by which its members were animated. And in the midst of their important duties as teachers, and their ceaseless activity in other spheres, they have wonderfully preserved the *integrity* of their Constitutions. Any attempt on the part of the members to depart from the *fundamental teachings* of the Church is resisted with stern severity; while, in matters of opinion, they are allowed the largest freedom, which some of them have at times deplorably abused.

In forming a judgment upon the fourth vow of the Jesuits, and generally upon many other points peculiar to the Society, it will be well to bear in mind that the primary aim of its founders was to assume an attitude *in every way absolutely opposed to whatever was Protestant.* Protestantism assailed the Center of Unity, and aimed at destroying the papacy. The Jesuits, on this very account, bound themselves indissolubly to the Holy See. Protestants enlarged the bounds of liberty till it became license; the Jesuits bound themselves by their Rule to unconditional obedience, even sacrificing their individual wills to the interests of the Society. Protestants, as their own writers avow, often acted under the impulse of passion, without reflection and without foresight, and were in consequence for a long time unable to unite themselves in any sort of organization; the founders of the Society of Jesus, on the contrary, following the noble inspirations of religion, formed themselves into an organization, which is a marvel of unity, and directed their actions with far-seeing wisdom and consummate prudence.

Elements, usually antagonistic to each other, are here found existing together in harmony. The explanation of the phenomenon may be obtained from a consideration of the char-

Hosted by Google

acter of the founders. While *Ignatius* was all aglow with a pure and chivalrous enthusiasm, which to some seemed extravagant, and was consumed with a zeal so ardent and a love so tender for Christ and His Church that he appeared to have no other thought, *Lainez* was a calm, discreet, far-seeing man, gifted with a strong will and a talent for organization, seemingly having been born to govern. To the zeal and strong faith of Ignatius, Lainez added discretion and a knowledge of the objects of belief. The principles of interior life, upon which the Society is based, came from Ignatius; from Lainez, the form and organization through which its aims and purposes are attained.[1] The respective qualities of both these men coalesced from the very outset, the one being the complement of the other, and the same differences of character and talent and the same harmony of action have been preserved with singular uniformity throughout the history of the Society they founded, and whose energy and activity have been such that it is impossible to trace its fortunes without feelings of the liveliest interest. Great courage, indomitable energy, genuine devotion, consummate prudence, and a clear view of the object to be attained, were necessary to successfully arrest the progress of Protestantism, and these were all embodied in the Society of Jesus.

§ 347. *Labors of the Jesuits.*

Testimonials of Popes, Princes, and Scholars, Clerical and Lay, to the Jesuits, or Temple of Honor to the Society of Jesus, Vienna, 1841.

The summary of facts that follows will serve to give some notion of the marvelous activity displayed by the Jesuits in the interests of the Church. It would seem that Germany, the cradle of Protestantism, had literally lapsed into barbarism. The universities, which were rapidly going to decay, were threatened with utter ruin. Ignorance the most profound pervaded the bulk of the people; and since, to be a good Protestant, it was only necessary to deny certain truths

[1] *Genelli* (l. c., pp. 238 and 402 sq.), in comparing these men, and showing the relations of the one to the other, takes a view different from the one given above. His arguments have not convinced us that his view is the correct one.

Hosted by Google

of Catholic doctrine, a decided tendency toward the teachings of the Reformation was soon visible, even in countries like *Austria*, which had been strictly Catholic.[1] Twenty years went by, and not a single priest came forth from the once flourishing University of Vienna. Protestant ministers were everywhere to be seen. *Ferdinand I.*, seeing the condition of affairs, resolved to invite (1551) the Jesuits into his dominions. Of those who were sent to him, *Lejay* and *Canisius*[2] were the most distinguished. The latter gave instructions, apparently without intermission; preached often; reorganized the university on a new basis; published a new catechism; prudently administered the affairs of the diocese; and thus, by restoring order, not only stayed the advance of heresy, but also succeeded in bringing back to the Catholic faith the bulk of those who had gone over to Protestantism. The celebrated college of the Jesuits at Freiburg, in Switzerland, is another witness to the zeal and activity of Canisius. He was beatified November 20, 1864.

For similar reasons the Jesuits went to *Bavaria*.[3] *Lejay* led the advance-guard against Protestantism in that country, and not long after (1549) the department of theology at *Ingolstadt* was handed over to them. *Lejay* explained the Psalms, *Salmeron* the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles, and *Canisius* taught dogmatic theology.[4] In 1559 the Jesuits were invited to Munich. Here their great aim was to revive a taste for classical and general literature and the sciences. Protestants had proscribed the teaching of these on the ground that they savored too much of the world, were useless in themselves, and positively harmful to a truly religious education; but the Catholic Church had learned from costly experience that the absence of high culture in her most devoted champions had been seriously detrimental to her inter-

[1] Emperor Ferdinand II., in his Struggle against the Protestant Estates of Upper Austria (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 675 sq., 742 sq.; Vol. IV., pp. 13 sq., 168 sq., 219 sq.

[2] *Dorigny, S. J.*, la vie du R. P. Pierre Canisius, fondateur du célèbre collége de Fribourg, Avign. 1829. *Riess*, Blessed Peter Canisius, S. J., Freiburg, 1865.

[3] Conf. § 318.

[4] *Winter*, Hist. of the Evangelical Doctrine in Bavaria, Vol. II., p. 167.

Hosted by Google

ests. From this time forth the assaults of the enemies of the Church in Bavaria were ably repulsed.

During this season of comparative peace the Jesuits founded colleges at *Cologne* (1556), at *Treves* (1561), at *Mentz* (1562), at *Augsburg* and *Dillingen* (1563), at *Ellwangen* and *Paderborn* (1585), at *Wuerzburg* (1586), at *Aschaffenburg*, *Münster*, and *Salzburg* (1588), at *Bamberg* (1595), at *Anvers*, *Prague*, and *Posen* (1571), and at *Constance* (1604), besides many in other countries. They were everywhere the stay and bulwark of the Church. Their works on theology, philosophy, and philology were of great merit and widely known. Such were the *De particulis linguae Latinae*, by *Tursellin;* the *De idiotismis linguae Graecae*, a work on grammar, by *Viger;*[1] the *Progymnasmata*, or Exercises in Latin Composition, by *Pontanus;* works on the purity of the Latin language, by *Perpinianus* († 1566), *Vernulaeus*, and others;[2] on poetry, by *James Balde*, the Horace of Germany, by *Sarbiewski*, *Juvenci*, *Vanière*, *Spee*, and *Avancini;*[3] on mathematics and astronomy, by *Clavius*, *Hell*, *Scheiner*, *Schall*, *de Bell*, and *Poczobut* at *Wilna;* on natural history, by *Kircher*, *Nieremberg*, and *Raczynski;* on geography, by *Acunha*, *Charlevoix*, *Dobrizhofer*, and *Gerbillon;* and on the science of politics, by *Aquaviva*, *Mariana*, *Ribadeneira*, and *Contzen.*[4]

[1] *Hand*, the philologist of Jena, published a new edition of *Turselin's* Particulae, and *Gottfried Hermann*, of Leipsig, a revised edition of *Viger's* Idiotismi, both of which are highly esteemed.

[2] *Joan. Perpiniani* Lusitani Opp. Rom. 1749, 4 T. Special praise is bestowed on his eighteen speeches, delivered at Rome, Lyons, and Paris. The most remarkable of them are: De Societatis Jesu gymnasiis; de perfecta doctoris christiani forma; de Deo Trino et Uno; de retinenda veteri religione ad Lugdunenses et Parisienses. *Ruhnken*, in his ed. of the works of Muret, says "that Perpinian would have disputed the palm of eloquence with Muret, if he had not been cut short in the midst of his career." *Vernulaeus*, elogia oratoria on the heroes of the Thirty Years' War; volumen singulare orationum sacrarum. Conf. *Goettlingii*, Commentatio de Nic. Vernulaeo, *Schilleri* antecessore in tragoediis Viraginis Aurelian. et Wallenstenii, Jen. 1862.

[3] Parnassus S. J., i. e. poemata Patrum S. J., Frcf. 1654, 2 T., 4to.

[4] *Smets*, What has the Order of the Jesuits done for Science? Aix-la-Chapelle, 1834. *De Backer*, Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus, Liége, 1854 (deuzième série). *George Westermayer*, James Balde, his Life and his works, Munich, 1868. Memorial of the Second Centennial, or Select Poems of James Balde, transl. by *Schrott* and *Schleich*, Munich, 1870. Complete Latin

Hosted by Google

That the method of teaching followed by the Jesuits, who cultivate both intellect and heart by allying science with religion, and stimulate a generous rivalry by various ingenious expedients, is admirably adapted to the education of youth, has been at all times confessed by those best capable of judging.[1] *Speculative theology* and *higher philosophy* had also their exponents in the Society. The names of *Suarez*, *Toletus*, *Ripalda*, and *Petavius* are familiar to every student. It is, however, its special distinction that it has at all times upheld and exemplified in its members a high standard of morality. The example of St. Ignatius had a powerful influence upon his followers. In Italy and at Rome he labored successfully for the correction of the morals of the people. He opened houses of refuge, under the direction of the *Society of St. Martha*, for fallen but repentant females, and established the Convent of St. Catharine for those whose chastity was in peril. So completely did the Jesuits reform the easy morals and sinful luxury of the Portuguese, that an eye-witness, speaking of the change they had wrought, said: "They wish to found another Sparta." It was only natural that a general desire should be expressed to have bishops appointed from a body of men so conspicuous for intellectual activity and moral probity; but Ignatius († July 31, 1556) refused his consent, because he felt that the possession of so considerable a dignity would be inconsistent with the poverty and humility professed by his followers, and that the fact of such honors being open to them might foster ambition and otherwise do harm to a Society whose members were to be, above all things, soldiers of Christ, ready at all times to go where God might call. This extreme rigor was somewhat relaxed under *Lainez* (1558–1565), the second general of the Society, but again strictly enforced by his successor, *Francis Borgia* (1566–1572), the great grandson of Alexander VI., to whose life that of the illustrious Jesuit formed so marked and redeeming a contrast. It is not sur-

ed. of the Carmina lyrica Jac. Balde, ed. *Hipler*, Monast. 1856; likewise in Lps., and by *Sarbiewski*.

[1] The Jesuits and their Colleges (Cath. Eccl. Journal of *Passau*, 1842). *Karl*, The Old and the New Course of Studies, Mentz, 1846. *Kleutgen*, The Theology of Antiquity, Münster, 1853 sq., 3 vols.

Hosted by Google

prising to find men so distinguished for virtue and learning soon called to preach at courts, and to be the spiritual guides of princes and those about their persons. Experience had shown that princes, whether for good or ill, according to their dispositions, had greatly influenced the destinies of the Church. Still it will ever remain a source of regret to Catholics that some of these good men allowed themselves to be drawn into the meshes of State diplomacy. In one of his circular letters, addressed to the members of the Society, Francis Borgia expressed his pain that some of them should have become mixed up in political affairs. He also chided those who had given themselves too exclusively to purely scientific studies. "You have put aside," said he, "the pride that aspires to ecclesiastical dignities, and you have done well; but you are ambitious to write great works, and thus gratify it by other means. As lambs have we entered, but we rule as wolves; we shall be cast out as dogs, but as eagles shall we be renewed." A similar spirit animated *Everard Mercurian*, a native of Luxemburg, while presiding over the Society (1573–1580).

The curriculum of studies (*ratio studiorum*) and the system of pedagogics followed by the Jesuits were drawn up and received their final form from *Claudius Aquaviva*, the fifth general (1581–1615).[1]

[1] The following were generals of the Society: *Mutio Vitelleschi*, Nov. 15, 1615—Febr. 9, 1645; *Vincent Caraffa*, Jan. 7, 1646—June 8, 1649; *Francis Piccolomini*, Dec. 13, 1649—June 17, 1651; *Alexander Gotfredi*, Jan. 21, 1652—March 12, same year; *Goswin Nickel*, March 17, 1655—1664; *John Paul Oliva*, Vicar-General of the Order, cum spe succedendi, 1664—1681; *Charles de Noyelle*, 1682—Dec. 12, 1686; *Gonzales de Santalla*, July 6, 1687—Oct. 27, 1705; *Michael Angelo Tamburini*, Jan. 30, 1706—1730; *Francis Retz*, 1730—1750; *Ignatius Visconti*, 1751; *Aloysius Centurione*, 1755; *Lawrence Ricci*, May 21, 1758—1773. Cf. Imagines Praepositorum Generalium soc. Jesu delineatae, et aereis formis expressae ab Arnoldo van Westerhout, addita brevi unius cujusque vitae descriptione a P. Nicol. *Galeotti* ed. II., Rom. 1751; on the generals in particular, see *Buss*, p. 641 sq.

Hosted by Google

§ 348. *The Other Orders.*

Holstenius-Brockie, Codex regularum monasticarum. The works of *Hélyot, Biedenfeld, Henrion-Fehr.* See Vol. I., p. 748.

It has been frequently and justly remarked that the *degeneracy of the clergy, and their neglect to instruct the people in their religious duties,* thus bringing upon the latter innumerable *corporal and spiritual evils,* had prepared the way for the introduction of Protestantism. The various religious communities now set themselves to remedy this condition of affairs, and began to emulate each other in the zeal with which they instructed the people. But, if this work was to be properly done, it was plainly the duty of the clergy to begin by reforming themselves. This was the motive that occasioned the founding of the following orders:

1. The *Capuchins.* It was the special aim of the Order to root out the love of wealth, and generally to banish the spirit of worldliness that in many places had crept into the older monasteries and convents. To effect this purpose they practised in their own persons the most rigorous poverty, the most austere self-denial, and the most profound humility, thus making themselves patterns of virtue to the world, stimulating men to strive after a higher standard of excellence, and, above all, fitting themselves to render efficient service to priests burdened with the weighty and responsible care of souls. The Capuchins were only a branch of the great Franciscan Order, and their mode of life a modification of its Rule. Among the Franciscans the severity of their Rule had early become a subject of discussion, which finally led to a secession of some of the members, of whom *Matteo de' Bassi,* of the convent of Montefalcone, was the leading spirit. These were rigorists who desired to restore the primitive austerity of the Order. They began by a change of dress, adding to the usual monastic habit a "*cappuccio,*" or pointed hood, which Matteo claimed was of the same pattern as that worn by St. Francis. By the bull *Religionis zelus* (1528), Matteo obtained from Pope *Clement VII.* leave for himself and his companions to wear this peculiar dress; to allow

Hosted by Google

their beards to grow; to live in hermitages, according to the Rule of St. Francis; and to devote themselves chiefly to the reclaiming of great sinners.[1] *Paul III.* afterward gave them permission to settle wheresoever they liked. Consistently with the austerity of their professions, their churches were unadorned, and their convents built in the simplest style. They became very serviceable to the Church, and their fearlessness and assiduity in waiting upon the sick during a plague, which ravaged the whole of Italy, made them extremely popular. The progress of these reformed Hermits[2] received a rude shock from the conduct of *Ochino*, their third *Vicar General*, who, after having become eminent as an earnest preacher, led a young girl astray, went over to Protestantism (1542), and was shortly after married at Geneva. The punishment of his misconduct was visited upon his brethren, who for two years were forbidden to preach. They, however, soon regained their merited consideration, and did excellent service in the cause of the Church. They were peculiarly adapted to the needs of the age, spread rapidly, and their popularity was such that many persons of distinction enrolled themselves among them. Of those it will be sufficient to instance *Alphonsus d'Este, Duke of Modena; Henry, Duke of Joyeuse;* and *Joseph le Clerc du Tremblay.*

2. The *Theatines.* About the year 1524 a number of Italian prelates formed an association for serving the sick, and thus gaining souls to Christ. The scope of the association was gradually widened, so as to include *the correction of the manners of the clergy*,[3] their advancement in learning, and the fostering of a spirit of self-denial, to the end that they might be able to go through the functions of their office with dignified decorum, and exclude from their sermons every coarse

[1] *Bolland.* m. Maj. T. IV., p. 233. *Boverio*, Ann. ord. Minor. qui Capucini nuncupantur. Lugd. Bat. 1632 sq., 3 T., f. M. a. *Tugio.* Bullar. ord. Capucinor. Rom. 1740 sq., 7 T., f. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 24, pp. 192 sq.

[2] Their real name was "*Hermits Friars Minor*," but the people gave them the name of "*Cappuccini*," an endearing diminutive from *Cappuccio;* hence their later appellation "Capuchins." (Tr.)

[3] Clementis VII. approbatio, etc., in *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 12, p. 84 sq. Bullar. Rom., T. I., p. 659. *Holstenius-Brockie*, T. V., pp. 342 sq. Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. X., pp. 831 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 23, p. 274 sq.

Hosted by Google

and unbecoming expression. To prepare for death those condemned to capital punishment, the Theatines regarded as their peculiar charge. *Gaetano di Tiene*, a Venetian, appears to have been the real founder of this association. Going to Rome by advice of his confessor, he won over to his views *John Peter Caraffa*, then Archbishop of Chieti (Latin, Theate), and prevailed upon him to become superior of the new Order. Elected Pope some time later, under the name of *Paul IV.*, Caraffa gave to the members of the Order, which had been approved some time before by *Clement VII.*, as the "*Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation*," the name of *Theatines*. As preachers and missionaries, the Theatines became a pattern to the rest of the clergy. By their vow of poverty, they were forbidden to possess property; were to subsist entirely upon the alms of the faithful, and were strictly inhibited from begging or in any way soliciting contributions.

3. The *Somaschans*. This congregation of regular clergy received its name from the little town of *Somascha*, in the Milanese territory. It was founded in 1528 by *St. Jerome Emilian*,[1] the son of a Venetian senator. It was approved in 1540 by Paul III., received many privileges from Pius IV., and raised to the rank of a monastic Order by Pius V. in 1568. By their Rule, the members were bound to the observance of a life of austerity; to unceasing prayer, protracted through the night; to the instruction of the inhabitants of the rural districts; and, particularly, to the care of orphans. Their schools at Rome, Pavia, and other cities of Italy were of unusual excellence.

4. The *Barnabites*. This was also a congregation of regular clergy. They are so called from the Church of St. Barnabas at Milan, where they came together, like the early Christians, to live a life in common, and devote themselves to the office of teaching. The founders of the Barnabites (1530) were three gentlemen, viz: *Anthony Maria Zaccaria*, of Cremona; *Bartholomew Ferrera* and *James Anthony Morigia*, of Milan. The congregation was approved by Clement VII. in 1532, and

[1] Vita Hieronymi Aemiliani (*Bolland.*, Acta SS. mensis Febr., T. II.) *Holsten.*, T. III., p. 199 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 33, p. 263 sq.

Hosted by Google

in 1535 its members were permitted to take solemn vows by *Paul III.* From this time forth it took rank as an Order, having a general, who held office for three years, but might be re-elected.[1] Its work was chiefly confined to giving *missions* in Christian countries; to the *instruction of youth;* and the direction of *seminaries.* Some of the Barnabites were appointed to professorships at Milan, Pavia, and other Italian cities.

5. The *Oblates*, or Volunteers, established by *St. Charles Borromeo* in 1578, are a congregation of secular priests, somewhat resembling the two preceding Orders. Their special aim was to give edification to the diocese, and to maintain the integrity of religion by the purity of their lives, by teaching, and by zealously discharging the duties committed to them by their bishop.[2] These devoted ecclesiastics were very much loved by St. Charles, who was wont to call them his *children*, and was never so happy as when among them. Strange to say, they do not seem to have been much appreciated elsewhere.

6. The *Oratorians* were founded by *Philip Neri*, a Florentine.[3] Philip, after going through his academical studies with distinction, went to reside at Rome, where he devoted himself to instructing the youth and serving the sick in the hospitals. In 1548 he founded the Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity, which grew so rapidly in public favor that Philip was enabled solely by voluntary contributions to build a hospital for poor pilgrims. The Oratory (*Oratorium*), in which the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers were read and explained to the Pilgrims, being much too small to accommodate the throngs that came there, Pope Paul IV., in 1558, put a church sufficiently large at the dis-

[1] Bullar. Rom., T. I., p. 689. *Holsten.*, T. V., pp. 449 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch 15, pp. 119 sq.

[2] Cf. *Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo, p. 371 sq.

[3] *Gallonius*, Vita Phil. Nerii, Mogunt. 1602. *Poesl*, Life of St. Philip Neri, Ratisbon, 1857. *Faber*, Life of St. Philip Neri, Germ. tr., Ratisbon, 1859. *Hélyot*, Vol. VIII., ch. 10. *Holsten.*, T. VI., p. 234 sq. and p. 529 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XXII. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. VII., pp. 506–515; Fr. tr., s. v. *Neri*, Vol. 16, pp. 56 sq.

Hosted by Google

posal of Philip. The Congregation approved in 1574 by Gregory XIII., under the name of the "*Congregation of the Oratory*," was at first composed of both ecclesiastics and laymen, *who, however, took no distinctive vows.* It was Philip's idea to found a Congregation in which such as did not feel themselves called to enter any of the established Orders might enjoy all their benefits without assuming their obligations. Although the avowed aim of the Congregation was the instruction of the people, its members from the very beginning gave themselves up to deep and serious study. Many of them, like *Baronius*, *Odéric Raynald*, *Gallonio*, and *Andrew Gallandi*, became eminent in literature. Philip was canonized by Pope Gregory XV. in 1622.

Following the example of St. Philip Neri, the great statesman, Abbé *Bérulle*[1] (created cardinal in 1627), together with four other priests, established (1611) *in France the Oratory of Jesus*, for the purpose of reforming the French clergy. The Oratory was approved in 1613 by Paul V. The members were divided into the *incorporated* and *associated*, neither taking vows of any kind. Their number increased rapidly, and included many distinguished scholars and preachers. Of these, *Malebranche*, *Morin*, *Thomassin*, *Richard Simon*, *Bernard Lamy*, *Houbigant*, *Lelong*, and *Massillon* are the best known.

7. The *Congregation of Saint Maur.* The Order of St. Benedict, once so active and prosperous, became lax and infected with the spirit of the world in France as in other countries. In the midst of abundance it had grown poor. After many vain efforts at reform by others, *Didier de la Cour*,[2] Prior of

[1] *Habert de Cerisi*, Vie de Pierre de Berulle, Paris, 1646, 4to. *Tabaraud*, Histoire de Pierre de Berulle, Paris, 1817, 2 vols., 8vo. Cf. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., pp. 249–254. †**Herbst*, Literary Services of the French Oratory (Tübing. Quart., year 1835, nro. 3), an Essay, which has unfortunately remained unfinished.

[2] (*Haudiquer*), Hist. du vén. Dom Didier de la Cour, réformateur des Ben., Par. 1772. (*Tassin*), Hist. lit. de la congr. de St. Maur, Par. 1726, 4to; Brux. 1770, 4to, with observations by Meusel, Frkf. and Lps. 1773, 2 vols. Cf. †**Herbst*, The Services of the Congr. of St. Maur rendered to the cause of science, Tübg. Theol. Review, 1833, nros. 1 sq. See *Hélyot*, Vol. VI., ch. 35, p.

Hosted by Google

the Abbey of St. Vannes, at Verdun in Lorraine, undertook and successfully accomplished the work. Set over this abbey while still young, he entered upon and closely pursued a severe course of studies by way of preparation for a still more thorough course at some university. Returning full of zeal, after having accomplished his purpose, from the University of Pont-à-Mousson, he resolved to exert all his influence in an effort to have his brethren apply themselves to sacred studies as a step toward a necessary reform. When he had succeeded in introducing a strict observance into his own abbey of *St. Vannes* and that of *St. Hidulph*, he also prevailed, but with some difficulty, upon the community of the abbey of *Moyen-Moutier* to accept the reform, and the three restored the primitive severity of the Rule of St. Benedict. The Reform was at first regarded with some suspicion, but after its approval by Clement VIII., in 1604, it met with more favor, and was introduced into many of the Benedictine monasteries. In 1618, at a General Chapter, held in the convent of *St. Mansuy*, at Tulle, it was resolved to unite the *reformed houses* together in a distinct Congregation, under the patronage of *St. Maur*, *St. Benedict's* greatest disciple. This *Congregation* received the authorization of Gregory XV., and *Richelieu* did what he could to promote its success. It soon included one hundred and eighty abbeys and conventual priories. Besides the Rule of St. Benedict, it had certain statutes peculiar to itself, and was presided over by a general, who resided in the Cloister of *St. Germain-des-Prés*, at Paris. The spirit and efficiency of the new Order were manifest in its ability in directing ecclesiastical seminaries, but, above all, in the number of distinguished scholars it produced. Among them are names eminent in palaeography and chronology, in civil and ecclesiastical history, but notably in patrology. It will be sufficient to mention those of *Mabillon*, *Montfaucon*, *Ruinart*, *Thuillier*, *Martène*, *Durand*, *Ménard*, *d'Achéry*, *le Nourry*, *Martianay*, *Massuet*, *Touttée*, *Maran*, *Coustant*, *de la Rue*, *Garnier*, *Aubert*, *Clémencet*, *Ceillier*, *Rivière*, and others,

318 sq.; ch. 37, p. 335 sq. *Henrion-Fehr*, I. 187–193. *Chavin de Malan*, Hist. de D. Mabillon et de la congrégation de St. Maur, Paris, 1843 (hasty).

Hosted by Google

whose patristic labors and works on Church History have gained for them an undying fame.

8. The *Carmelites*. *St. Teresa*, whose *religious* life had been spent under the Carmelite Rule, as modified by Eugene IV., brought about a complete reform in the Order. Born at Avila, in Old Castile, in 1515, she was the daughter of Alfonso, of the noble house of Sanchez de Cayeda, and, as a child, was remarkable for extraordinary piety. Called by God to lead souls along the way to perfection, she learned by her own experience the weakness and instability of the human heart. After a long and violent struggle between a vivid consciousness of duty and the sluggish performance of it, between love of God and attachment to the world, she finally shook off the bonds that had bound her to earth, and gave herself generously to God. The conflict she passed through during this season of trial is told with simple and unaffected frankness in the story of her life. The sensitive delicacy of her feelings, and the workings of her luminous intellect, are there portrayed with wonderful vividness. Her teaching, as set forth in her *writings*,[1] has served as a light to guide numberless souls to perfection, and, in the office of her feast, is dignified by the Church with the title of *celestial*. She went to her reward in the year 1582, seemingly more consumed by a yearning to be with her God than wasted by the ravages of disease. With the consent and approbation of Pius IV., Teresa set to work in 1562 to reform the convents of women belonging to the Order of Mount Carmel. She was opposed from the very outset; but strong in the strength of God, she overbore all obstacles, and in the end her efforts were wholly successful. From convents of women, the reform extended

[1] These have been translated into French, Polish, German, and other European languages. The works of St. Teresa of Jesus have been edited by *G. Schwab*, Sulzbach, 1831–1833, 5 vols. Selections from her Writings, by *Fred. Schlosser*, Frankfort, 1827–1832. *Jocham*, An Abridgment of the Writings of St. Teresa, Ratisbon, 1863. On the reform of St. Teresa, cf. *Hélyot*, Vol. I., ch. 48, pp. 425 sq. The best account of her life is to be found in the continuation of the *Acta Sanctorum*, by the Bollandist Fathers, Vol. VII., for October. †*Hennes*, Life of St. Teresa, 2d ed., Mentz, 1866. *Bouix, S. J.*, Life of St. Teresa, tr. from the French into German, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1868.

Hosted by Google

to convents of men, where it was still more obstinately opposed. Her final success was mainly due to the efforts of *St. John of the Cross*,[1] whose *mystical writings* are, if anything, more remarkable than those of St. Teresa herself. Her disciples, the *Discalced Carmelites*, both male and female, have been distinguished by their disinterested devotion to works of charity, and by their zeal in fostering and promoting a love of a contemplative life. Since her death, her reform has been introduced into every Catholic country.

9. The *Order of the Visitation*. This, like the preceding Order, was founded by the joint efforts of two devout souls, viz., *St. Francis de Sales*[2] and Madame *Frances de Chantal*.[3] St. Francis was born at the family castle of Sales, near Annecy in Savoy, August 21, 1567, and having studied at the provincial colleges of La Roche and Annecy, went to Paris (1578), where he completed his course of rhetoric and philosophy under the Jesuits. In 1584 he went to the University of Padua to study canon and civil law, and completed his course in 1591 with great distinction. While there he put himself under the spiritual direction of Father *Possevin*, a Jesuit, who, being truly a man of God, spoke to the young student of the wounds of the Church, which, he said, were in all cases traceable to the corruption of the clergy. On his return home, he learned that his father had obtained for him a place in the senate, and arranged a very honorable and advantageous marriage; but these he declined, having made up his mind to take Orders, and give himself wholly to the service of God.

[1] Complete works, tr. into German by *Schwab*, Sulzbach, 1830, 2 pts., 2d ed., by *Jocham*, Sulzbach, 1858.

[2] *Oeuvres* de Saint François de Sales, Paris, 1834, 16 vols.; Paris, 1836, 4 vols., 4to; Paris (L. Vivès 5th ed.), 1869–1874, 12 vols., 8vo. His Life, by *Chas. Aug. de Sales*, 1634; Marsollier, 1747; 5th ed., Paris, 1870, 2 vols. *Boulanger*, Studies on St. Francis of Sales, trans. from the French into German, Munich, 1861, 2 vols. *Bougard*, Vie de St. François de Sales; Germ. by *Lager*, Ratisb. 1871, 2 vols. His most influential works were: *Lettres à divers gens du Monde;* but particularly his *Philothea*, which has been honored with countless translations; Spirit of St. Francis of Sales, gathered from his writings; Theotimus, etc.

[3] *Louis Clarus*, Life of St. Jeanne Frances de Chantal, Schaffh. 1861. *Daurignac*, St. Jeanne Franc. de Chantal, etc., Paris, 1858 (Germ., Ratisbon, 1860); 2d ed., 1867; by *Clarus*, Hildesheim, 1870.

Hosted by Google

As a priest his virtues and his piety were such that he was soon called to be coadjutor bishop of the diocese of *Geneva*, to which he succeeded on the death of Mgr. Granier, in 1602. His eloquence, which was convincing and *popular*, brought many heretics back to the Church, and his *writings*, graceful, original, and *breathing a spirit of love and tenderness*, have continued to our own day to guide many faithful souls in the ways of piety.

The *congregation of women*, founded by him, conjointly with Madame de Chantal, at Annecy, in 1610, was not at first strictly bound to observe the rules of religious bodies living in common, the chief aim of the good ladies being primarily to serve the sick. Some time later, St. Francis enjoined upon them the observance of the *Rule of St. Augustine*, to which he added some particular constitutions of his own; and in 1618 Paul V. raised the congregation to the rank of a religious Order, under the title of the *Order of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin*. To their original purpose, that of educating the youth of their own sex was now added.[1] Before Francis closed his eyes in death he had the gratification of seeing eighty-seven houses of his Order established in France and Savoy alone, and since that time they have become numerous in Italy, Germany, Poland, and North America.

10. The *Ursulines*[2] were at first an association of pious ladies, formed at Brescia about the year 1537, by *Angela de' Merici*, a native of *Desenzano*, a town on Lake Garda. This angelic soul, who is better known as Angela of Brescia, found her only joy in communing with God, forgetting self, and ministering to the wants of others. In this spirit of self-denial, she gathered about her a few ladies as unselfish and generous as herself, and placing the little band under the patronage of St. Ursula (November 25, 1535), began the work of reclaiming unfortunate women. The members of the Association, while tending the sick, relieving the poor, instruct-

[1] *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 43.

[2] *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 20–32. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 68–72. Biographies of the foundress: "The Life of St. Angela of Merici," Augsburg, 1811; by *Sintzel*, Ratisbon, 1842. *Saint-Foix*, Annales de l'ordre de St. Ursule, Clermont-Ferrand, 1858, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

ing young girls, and doing other works of charity, continued to reside in the homes of their parents or relatives. After the death of the foundress, January 27, 1540, the Association soon grew to be an Order, and was approved June 9, 1544, by Paul III., who also gave the members leave to make such changes in their Rule as circumstances might require. The leading object of the Order was now the *education of young ladies.* The organization of the Ursulines being still further perfected by *St. Charles Borromeo*, their special patron, was again approved by Gregory XIII. From Upper Italy the Order spread to France, where it was introduced by the accomplished widow, *Madeleine de St. Beuve.* She established a Mother House in Paris, to which many affiliated convents were soon attached. Their Rule, drawn up by Father Gontery, assisted by other Jesuits, and approved by *Paul V.*, for the use of the Congregation Regular of Ursulines (1612), was based upon the Rule of St. Augustine, but, in its present form, embraces, besides twenty-five chapters of "*Admonitions*" and eleven "*Legacies*," so called because they were drawn from the posthumous writings of St. Angela of Brescia. From this time forth the education of young girls of every age from childhood up was almost wholly in their hands, and their presence was hailed with joy in every country of Christendom.

An association of "*Young English Ladies*," founded by Miss *Mary Ward*,[1] the daughter of an English nobleman, who had continued loyal to the Catholic Church, had a similar object in view. She died in 1645.

11. The *Fathers of the Christian Doctrine.* The aim of this congregation, and the spirit with which it was animated, were in close sympathy with the spirit and aim of the Ursulines. Founded by *Caesar de Bus*, and approved by Clement VIII. in 1597, it subsequently coalesced with the *Somaschans*, thus forming an association of secular priests living under simple vows (1616). Owing, however, to disputes between the two

[1] The Life, Labors, and Portrait of *Mary Ward*, Augsburg, 1840. *Leitner*, Hist. of the Young English Ladies and their Establishments down to our own Day, Ratisbon, 1869. * *Schels*, Modern Religious Associations of Women, Schaffh. 1858, pp. 80–147. Cf. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., pp. 38–41.

Hosted by Google

branches, relative to the observance of their respective statutes (1647), Innocent X. commanded them to sever their connection with each other, and form distinct congregations; and Alexander VII., by decree, ordered both to establish novitiates, and to introduce the three monastic vows. The *Fathers of the Christian Doctrine* continued to dress as secular priests.

Other religious congregations of both men and women, having nearly, if not quite the same object and scope, were established in France and elsewhere. Such were the *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, founded by *John Baptist de la Salle*, a canon of Rheims (1651–1714), and approved by Benedict XIII.;[1] and the *Sisters of the Schools of the Infant Jesus* and the *Daughters of Providence*, both of which were united into one congregation in 1681, by *Nicholas Barré*, a Franciscan, who also established normal schools for training teachers. These bound themselves to teach gratuitously, and their appointments depended upon the discretion of their superiors.[2] Such also were the associations founded by *Mark de Sadis Cusani*, in 1652, and by *John Leonardi*, at Lucca, in 1570.

12. The *Piarists*, or Brethren of the Pious Schools (*Piarum scholarum Patres*), in zeal the rivals of the Jesuits, were founded by a Spanish priest, *Joseph Calasanze* († 1648), for the education of youth.[3] Having resigned his office of vicar-general to the Bishop of Urgel, Calasanze visited Rome, where he led an austere and exemplary life, and attracted attention by his zeal in providing, during a protracted season of epidemic, for the temporal and spiritual wants of the afflicted. His efforts in behalf of destitute orphans were also unceasing and efficient. With the approbation of Pope Clement VIII., he associated with himself, in the year 1600, a number of secular priests for the education of youth. They were approved

[1] *Hélyot*, Vol. VIII., ch. 30. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, established by John B. de la Salle; their Constitution, Organization, and Rule, Germ. tr., Augsburg, 1844. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 292 sq.

[2] *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 291.

[3] *Holstentus-Brockie*, T. VI., p. 439 sq. *Helyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 39, p. 331 sq. Cf. Life and Miracles of *Jos. Calasanze*, tr. from the Italian into German, Vienna, 1748.

Hosted by Google

as a religious congregation by Paul V., and by Gregory XV., in the year 1621, as an Order (*Ordo Patrum Piarum Scholarum*). Their special mission was to educate the young in the arts and sciences; but, above all, to train them to habits of holy living. They soon extended the field of their labors, and their establishments were numerous in Austria, Poland, and other European countries. After the suppression of the Jesuits, their functions as teachers were in a great measure supplied by the Piarists.

13. The *Brothers of Charity* were founded in 1540 at Seville, in Spain, by the Portuguese, *John of God.* Born in 1495, John led a roving life until his forty-fifth year, when he was converted at Grenada by an impressive sermon of John Avila's, and from thenceforth (1540), he gave himself entirely to the service of the sick in the hospitals. The Archbishop of Granada and the Bishop of Tuy, admiring his efforts to copy in his life the broad charity and tender mercy of Our Savior, entered warmly into his plans, surnaming him "*John of God.*" He died in 1550, poor in the wealth of this world, but rich in good works. His companions, who continued to carry on his work, bound themselves still more closely to each other, by taking upon them the three monastic vows, with the additional obligation of gratuitously serving the sick in the hospitals. They received recognition as an Order, under the name of the *Brethren of St. John of God*, in 1617, from Pope Paul V.,[1] and have since continued to render important services within their sphere in every Catholic country. In the hospitals, to each of which only *one priest* was attached, they were as ready to serve *non-Catholics* as those of their own faith, their Constitution obliging them to make no distinction of faith, rank, or nation. Their founder was beatified in 1630 by Urban VIII., and canonized by Alexander VIII. in 1690.

14. The *Priests of the Missions*, or the *Lazarists*,[2] whose

[1] *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. VI., p. 264 sq. *Hélyot*, Vol. IV., ch. 18, p. 156 sq. *Wilmot*, Life of St. John of God, tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ., Ratisbon, 1862. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. II., p. 175 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 12, p. 133 sq.

[2] *Hélyot*, Vol. VIII., ch. 11. (Sometimes called the *Vincentian Congregation.*) (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

scope included in part that of every congregation previously established, have not unfrequently done very essential service to Christianity. Their founder, *St. Vincent de Paul* (*Vincentius a Paulo*—not *a Paula*), was born of humble but pious parents, in the village of Pouy, in the diocese of Acqs, at the foot of the Pyrenees, in 1576. In his youth he tended his father's flocks, but his parents, judging correctly that one of such excellent parts, both of intellect and heart, was fitted by nature for some higher calling, sent him, in 1588, to a Franciscan convent to be educated. While there he made the best of his opportunities, and feeling himself called to the priesthood,[1] went to perfect his studies at the University of Toulouse, where, after spending some years, he was ordained priest in 1600. He shortly after became head master of a school at *Buzet*, which acquired quite a reputation for the thoroughness and efficiency of its pupils. But his many and varied occupations did not hinder him from applying himself to serious study, and in 1604 he received the degree of bachelor of theology. In the course of a voyage from Marseilles to Narbonne, in 1605, he and his companions fell into the hands of some Barbary corsairs, who sold him into slavery at Tunis. Here he passed successively under the proprietorship of three masters, the third of whom, a Savoyard renegade, he brought back to the Church, and having returned to France, went thence to Rome, and prevailed upon his former master to join the Brothers of Charity in that city. Introduced to Henry IV. by the French embassador, Vincent, after satisfactorily executing some important commissions, was made almoner to Queen Margaret of Valois. Having too much leisure time on his hands to suit his active zeal, he entered the Oratory, lately established by the Abbé de Bérulle, on whose recom-

[1] *Abelly*, Vie de St. Vincent de Paule, instituteur et premier supérieur général de la Congrégation de la Mission, Paris, 1664, in numberless editions (English Life, by *Thompson*); German tr., by *Brentner*, Ratisbon, 1859, 5 vols. *Frcd. L. of Stolberg*, Life of St. Vincent de Paul, Münster, 1819. Since then there have appeared in France several biographies of the Saint; the last is that by †*Orsini*, translated into German by *Steck*, Tübing. 1843. The principal one by Abbé *Maynard*, Vie de St. Vincent de Paul, 4 vols., Paris, 1860. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p., 328 sq.

Hosted by Google

mendation he became successively curé of Clichy, near Paris, and tutor in the family of Count de *Gondi*, commander of the royal galleys. The ardent charity of Vincent never permitted him to be at rest. He alternately employed himself in instructing the children of the count, in edifying the whole family by his exemplary conduct and wise counsels, in prudently watching over the administration of their large estates, in instructing the sick, and catechizing the poor.

While in this position, Vincent, after hearing the confession of one, who, without deserving it, enjoyed a reputation for high sanctity, conceived the design of starting what are known as the *Missions of France*, the first experiment of which was made among the tenantry of the pious Countess de Gondi. Appointed to the care of souls at Chatillon, Vincent displayed marvelous energy, and undertook and successfully carried forward projects so vast, that even one of them would seem sufficient to call forth resources and occupy the life of an ordinary man. For instance, he founded the sisterhood known as the *Daughters of Charity*, or *Grey Sisters* (*Filles de la charité, soeurs grises*), to whom he gave a Rule of life, and charged them with the care of the hospitals (1618). Returning again to the family of Gondi, he occupied his time in giving missions, and in doing what he could to soften the hard lot of the galley-slaves, to whom, when his works were made known at the court of *Louis XIII.*, he was appointed almoner-general in 1619.

In 1620, he consented, at the request of his friend, *St. Francis de Sales*, to become spiritual director of the Convent of Visitation nuns at Paris. The project, which he had long had in his mind, of forming a society of *Priests of the Missions*, who, with the consent of the bishop of the diocese and of the pastor of the parish, would preach the Gospel to the peasants of the country, was, in the year 1624, carried into effect. For its realization, he was much indebted to the Gondi family, who contributed liberally themselves, and by their good example brought others to do the same.

In the year 1627, Louis XIII. made munificent donations to help on the work of the Missions in France. In 1632, Urban VIII. approved the object of the congregation, and

Hosted by Google

instructed Vincent to draw up a rule for its guidance. Foreseeing that the work of the Missions could do no permanent good, unless the priests in charge of parishes would zealously continue what had been begun, and fully conscious that as a rule the secular clergy could not be relied on for such persevering efforts, he took counsel with several bishops, who agreed that, in order to bring the clergy to an earnest and abiding sense of their duty, they should be made to undergo rigorous examinations, and to make spiritual retreats and hold *conferences* at the mission-houses.

After the death of the Countess de Gondi, in 1625, Vincent made the acquaintance of *Louise de Marillac*, widow of *M. Le Gras*,[1] a lady equally distinguished for purity of life and extensive learning. After severely testing her vocation for four years, he placed her, in 1629, over all the communities of *Grey Sisters*. The Society of "Priests of the Mission," which he had established at the so-called Priory of St. Lazarus in Paris, whence the name *Lazarists*, was soon widely extended. Besides their mission-labors, they took complete charge, in many instances, of ecclesiastical seminaries, which, in obedience to the instruction of the Council of Trent, had been established in the various dioceses, and even at this day many of these institutions are under their direction. In the year 1642, these devoted priests were to be seen in *Italy*, and not long after were sent to Algiers, to Tunis, to Madagascar, and to Poland. St. Vincent himself, even at the age of seventy-eight, continued to give missions, and was constantly engaged in founding *hospitals*, which he placed under the protection of the Holy Name of Jesus. He also promoted the future welfare of the French clergy by having various *religious associations* hold *conferences* in the Houses of the Missions.[2] The life of Vincent, so active and so crowded with good works,

[1] The Life and Spirit of the Venerable *Louise de Marillac*, by *Gobillon* (Germ., Augsburg, 1837), (*Clement Brentano*). The Sisters of Charity in their Relations to the Poor and the Sick, Coblentz, 1831. *Eremites* (Buss), The Order of the Sisters of Charity, 1845. *Droste* (Clement Augustus), On the Society of the Sisters of Charity, Münster, 1843.

[2] Vincent de Paul and the Manufacturing System of France (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. X.)

Hosted by Google

was closed by a holy death on the 27th of September, 1660, when he went to receive the crown of glory laid up for him in Heaven. He was canonized by Clement XII. in 1737.

§ 349. *Foreign Missions.*

Fabricii Lux salutaris, p. 662 sq. *Mamachii* Antiquit. chr., lib. II., Pt. II., c. 28–31. *Lettres édifiantes* et curieuses, écrites des missions étrangères par quelques Missionnaires de la Compagnie de Jesus, Paris, 1717–1777, 34 vols.; and in particular, Choix de lettres édifiantes, etc., précedé de tableaux géographiques, historiques, politiques, religieux, et litéraires des pays de missions, 3d edit., Paris, 8 vols. *Hazart*, S. J., Ch. H., i. e. Cath. Christianity propagated throughout the World, Vienna, 1594 sq., 5 vols., fol. †* *Wittmann*, Grandeur of the Church in her Missions since the Schism. General Hist. of the Missions during the last three Centuries, Augsburg, 1841 sq. *Henrion*, General Hist. of the Catholic Missions, Paris, 1846–1847, 4 vols. (Vol. II.) †*Marshall*, The Christian Missions. †*Hahn*, Hist. of the Catholic Missions, from Christ to our own Day, Cologne, 1857 sq., 5 vols. *Grundemann*, General Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867.

True ministers of the Gospel do not confine their charity and devote their lives solely to those nations that have been long loyal to the Christian faith. They also carry their labors and the light of their example among the heathen into lands the most remote and to peoples the most barbarous. Of all the Orders, none has shown such heroic zeal in missionary labors as the *Society of Jesus*. Many of its members had no other ambition, and could have no higher, than to spend their lives for love of Christ, laboring in some far-away mission. The discoveries lately made by the Spaniards and the Portuguese furnished them at once the opportunity and the means of carrying their wishes into effect; and the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (*Congregatio de propaganda fide*),[1] established in Rome in 1622, encouraged these zealous and courageous men in undertaking missionary expeditions, and imparted system and continuity to their efforts.

[1] Erectio S. Congr. de fide cath. propaganda (Bullar. Rom., T. III., p. 421 sq.) *Fabricii* Lux. salut., p. 566 sq. Constitt. Apostolicae S. Congr. de prop. fide, Rom. 1642, fol. *Bayeri* Hist. Congregat. Cardinalium de propaganda fide. Regiom. 1670, 4to. Cf. *Hélyot*, Vol. III., ch. 12, pp. 81–100, on the Various Institutions Founded for the Propagation of the Faith.

Hosted by Google

This Congregation, composed of fifteen cardinals, three prelates, and a secretary, received the abundant alms contributed for missionary work by the faithful, and distributed them with judgment and regularity. In 1627, Pope Urban VIII., appreciating the need of priests specially trained for the foreign missions, presented the Congregation with the large and commodious building, for a seminary, now known as the *Collegium Urbanum de Propaganda Fide.* The example of the Pope inspired others, and it was not long until munificent donations came pouring in from every side to help on the good work and put it on a secure basis. From every people and clime under the sun came students then, as in our own day, to be educated there for the work of the Apostolate, and by these representatives of every tongue is *the sublime spectacle of the Christian Pentecost annually re-enacted in Rome on the first Sunday after Epiphany.* On this day, the great feast of the Propaganda, the praises of the Triune God are spoken in languages representing every quarter of the world, thus exemplifying and giving expression to the grand idea that lies at the very foundation of the Catholic Church.[1]

In view of the striking resemblance between the mysteries of the Christian religion and the teachings of the *Vedas*, where, for example, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva stand for the three Persons of the *Trinity*, indicating the manner of the manifestation of the *primordial Being*, and where something very like an *incarnation* is related in connection with Vishnu, it seems strange that the Hindoos should have always opposed the most insuperable difficulties to the introduction of Christianity.[2] But the religious system of India, so closely bound up with the national life, the traditions, and sympathies of the people, could not be expected to give way without a struggle before the advance of the Gospel. Subject for nearly

[1] In 1867, forty-two boys and young men, one after another, spoke Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, Armenian, Arabic, Persian, Kurdish, Turkish, Coptic, the language of the Senegambians, Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Celtic, Irish, Dutch, German, the Swiss dialect, Danish, English, Illyric, Bulgarian, Albanian, Rhaethian, celebrating the advent of the Savior in hymns and canticles of love and gratitude.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 74 sq.

Hosted by Google

ten centuries to the yoke of the Mussulman, the Indian has clung to his national sanctuaries with a courage that must be admired; and while almost indifferent as to what sort of government he lives under, perseveringly defends his religious notions, and dwells with melancholy enthusiasm upon the departed glories of his people. To triumph over such obstacles required the noble exertions characteristic of the Society of Jesus.

Acting in obedience to the request of John III., King of Portugal, and with the sanction of the Pope, *Francis Xavier*, who, in zeal for the salvation of souls, in reliance on God, in heroic courage, and exhaustless patience, was second only to St. Paul, set sail for *Goa*, the capital of the Portuguese Indies, in 1542, where, since the year 1510, the Portuguese had been exerting themselves to make conversions, but had only succeeded in bringing back some Nestorians and Thomas-Christians to the Church. As a rule, the Christians of Goa, who openly practised polygamy and divorce, and lived dissolute lives, were such only in name.[1] Francis, seeing the necessity of first reforming the Christian colonists, began by gaining the children, and through them reached their parents. By serving the sick, comforting the afflicted, and by other exercises of his boundless charity, he soon acquired great influence with high and low and rich and poor. The tribe of the *Parawians*, witnessing his disinterested zeal, were soon favorably disposed toward Christianity. After a short stay at Goa, he went to the shores of *Travancore*, where, at the end of a month after his arrival, he had already baptized ten thousand idolaters. This wonderful success can be justly ascribed to no cause other than the miracles he wrought, the sweetness of his temper, his kindly charity, and the aid of good interpreters. "It was," said he, in his account of the event, "a

[1] *Horatius Tursellinus*, de vita Franc. Xav., qui primus e Soc. Jesu in India et Japonia evangelium propagavit, libb. IV., Rom. 1594, and frequently; also Epp. *Franc. Xav.*, libb. IV., Paris, 1631 (Germ. tr. and explan., by *J. Burg*, Cologne, 1836). *Reithmeyer*, Life of St. Francis Xavier, Schaffh. 1846; by *Bouhours*, London, 1688, Philad. 1841; by *Bartoli* and *J. P. Maffei*, Baltimore, 1859. *Maffei*, Histor. Indicar., libb. XII., Florent. 1588, fol. *Wittmann*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 9 sq. *Henry of Andlaw*, Musings of my Leisure-Hours, nro. 3, Freibg. 1864. †*Müllbauer*, Hist. of the Catholic Missions in East India, Munich, 1851.

Hosted by Google

touching sight to behold these neophytes emulating each other in the holy work of destroying the temples of the idols." Leaving Travancore, he set out for *Malacca* and *Isles of the Moluccas and Ternate.* He had already heard terrible accounts of the cannibalism and brutal morals of the inhabitants, but no dangers could shake the courage or chill the ardor of the *Apostle of the Hindoos.* "If aromatic groves and mines of gold were the prize," said he, "there would not be wanting those who would face any danger. And should missionaries yield to merchants in courage? If I save but a single soul, I shall be amply repaid for my toil and labor."

By persevering efforts, Francis succeeded in making many converts among this barbarous people, one of whom, catching somewhat of the zeal of his master, went to preach the Gospel in the Isle of *Manar.* Francis' next care was to have the Penitential Psalms, the Gospels, and a catechism translated into the Indian tongue, which having done, he visited the congregations he had lately established, and returning to *Goa,*[1] March 20, 1548, opened a seminary for the education of Hindoo youths, which continuing under the direction of the members of the Society, became, as time went on, a nursery of Christianity for all India. Satisfied of the flourishing condition of Christianity among the peoples he had already evangelized, Francis, in the year 1549, passed over to *Japan.* This country is divided into several kingdoms or circles, all of which are subject to a single emperor, Mikado, or Dairi-Sama. Before starting, he had had the Creed, together with explanations of the text, translated into the Japanese tongue. The people he found ill-disposed to receive Christianity, and the *Bonzes* or Buddhist priests offered a most stubborn resistance to its introduction; but, in the face of such opposition, he eventually succeeded in planting the faith in that land, his most notable conquests being made at *Amangouchi* and in the kingdom of *Bungo,* where, at the expiration of two and a half years, he had baptized several thousands of the natives.

Still later, some of the Japanese princes were converted,

[1] *Goa,* since 1532 an episcopal see, was raised to metropolitan rank in 1557, and the sees of Cochin, Malacca, and Meliapore were made suffragan to it.

Hosted by Google

and, as a token of their filial submission to the Head of the Church, sent, in the year 1582, a creditable embassy to Rome, which was received by Pope *Gregory XIII.* with unusual expressions of joy. The days of Francis were now drawing to a close, but before departing this life he longed to carry the faith to *China*, a country which foreigners were forbidden to enter under the severest penalties. After overcoming obstacles seemingly insurmountable, he landed on the island of *San Chan*, six miles out from the main land. Here the holy missionary brought the labors of his apostolic life to an end. After lingering twelve days upon the shores of this inhospitable island, with no friendly hand to succor and no friendly voice to comfort, he gave up his gentle spirit on the 3d of December, 1552, his last words being: "In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; let me not be confounded forever."[1]

The Jesuits took up and carried forward the work that St. Francis had begun. With the permission of the Archbishop of Cranganore, Father *Nobili* landed in India in 1606. Wearing the dress, and copying the habits of the Brahmins ("*Sanias*"), and avoiding all intercourse with the Parias, or the lowest class, who belong to none of the Hindoo castes, he by degrees commanded the respect and won the confidence of the former, of whom seventy were converted, bringing with them into the Church a numerous following. This plan of making converts by wearing the dress and falling in with the customs of the natives, gave rise to a protracted controversy between the Jesuits and Dominicans, known as the controversy "*On Malabar Customs*," a distorted account of which was sent to Pope Gregory XV. in 1623.

In the year 1587, when there were in *Japan*[2] two hundred thousand Christians, two hundred and fifty churches, thirteen

[1] The last verse of the Te Deum, or Hymn of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose.

[2] *Crasset*, Hist. de l'église de Japon, Par. 1715, 2 vols., 4to (Germ., with engravings, Augsburg, 1743). *P. de Charlevoix*, Hist. du Christian. dans l'emp. du Japon, Rouen, 1715, 3 T., par M. D. L. G., Par. 1836, 2 T. (Germ., Vienna, 1830). *Pagès*, Hist. de la religion chrétienne en Japon depuis 1598–1651, Paris, 1869–1870. *Mamachi*, Antiquit. chr., T. II., p. 376 sq. Cf. *Fabricius*, l. c., p. 678.

Hosted by Google

seminaries, and a novitiate of the Society of Jesus, a violent persecution broke out against the professors of the new faith. The Jesuits were ordered to quit the country in a body, but through the favor of some of the princes were permitted to remain. Some idea may be had of the extent of their labors in this country when it is related that one of their number, *Father Valignano* († 1606), had three hundred churches and thirty colleges erected by his individual efforts. The storm of persecution that had lately passed over the Christians was again evoked by the indiscreet zeal of the Franciscans, who revived the old controversy on "*Customs.*" What they had left undone was completed by the Hollanders, who were jealous of their enterprising commercial rivals, the Portuguese, and thus were blasted the hopes of permanently establishing Christianity in the Island Empire. The persecution that followed, commencing in 1596, was marked by deeds of blood and violence, unparalleled in any other age or country;[1] the memory of which was revived and perpetuated by our present Pontiff, *Pius IX.*, in 1862.

The desire to evangelize *China* continued to be cherished in the Society of Jesus after St. Francis had passed away. To overcome the serious difficulties that stood in the way of the enterprise, and to disarm the deep-seated prejudices of the Chinese, the *Jesuits* resorted to such ingenious devices as only zeal and charity could suggest.[2] They set themselves to study the manners, the character, and the habits of the people; they were by turn scholars, artisans, mechanics, laborers, becoming all to all that they might gain all to Christ. In the year 1582, three Jesuits, one of whom was the celebrated *Matteo Ricci*,[3] effected an entrance into the Chinese Empire.

[1] *Tanner*, Societas Jesu usque ad sanguinis et vitae profusionem militans, Pragae, 1675 (Germ. tr., Prague, 1683, 4 pts.) †*Rump*, The Japanese Martyrs, Münster, 1862.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 72 sq., and *Stuhr*, The Established Religion of the Empire of China, Berlin, 1835. *Abbé Huc*, Christianity in China, New York, 1857, 2 vols.; especially *Drey*, Apologetics, Vol. II., and *Gfroerer*, History of the Primitive Ages, Vol. I., p. 211 sq.

[3] *Wertheim*, Life of Ricci, in Pletz's New Theol. Review, 1833, nro. 3. *Gützlaff*, the most famous of modern Protestant missionaries, says of Ricci: "He spent but twenty-seven years in China, and during that time accomplished a

Hosted by Google

Ricci, by his splendid literary and scientific abilities, and by wisely assuming the dress and accommodating himself to the tastes of the upper classes, gained such consideration that he was permitted to fix his residence, first at *Canton*, and some time later at *Nanking*. Taking advantage of the high reputation he had acquired by the building of an observatory, and the contributions he had made to the science and literature of the country,[1] he began to preach the Gospel, converting many of the lower classes, and even some of the mandarins or state officials. His fame increased as time went on, and in the year 1600 he was permitted to settle permanently at *Peking*, where he gained the good-will of the emperor, converted many of the influential personages about court, and obtained leave to build churches. He died May 11, 1610; was buried with great pomp, and was universally mourned. Of his successors, all of whom emulated his zeal and energy, *Adam Schall*,[2] of Cologne (after 1622), was the most remarkable. He was called to preside over the mathematical society of Peking, and through his influence with the emperor obtained an edict authorizing him to build Catholic churches. Unfortunately, the progress of missionary work was greatly retarded by the ill-feeling between the Jesuits and Dominicans, growing out of the controversy on *Chinese customs*[3] (1645). In 1661, the imperial ministers, taking advantage of the youth and inexperience of the new emperor, began to persecute the Christians and to cast the missionaries into prison; but on the accession of *Kang-he* (1661), the Jesuits again recov-

Herculean task. He was the first Catholic missionary who penetrated into China, and when he died *there were in the several provinces more than three hundred churches.*"

[1] Among his works published in China are the following: A *Chinese Map of the World;* a little *Catechism*, containing the general principles of Christian morality; a treatise, entitled the *Art of Memory*, and a *Dialogue on Friendship*, in imitation of Cicero. The two last are ranked by the Chinese among their most esteemed books. (Tr.)

[2] *Schall*, Relatio de initio et progressu missionis Soc. Jesu in regno Chin., Viennae, 1665; Ratisbonae, 1672; Germ., with annotations, by *Mansegg*, Vienna, 1834. *Wittmann*, Vol. II., p. 138 sq. Hist. of the Catholic Missions in the Empire of China, Vienna, 1845, 2 vols.

[3] See § 374.

Hosted by Google

ered the imperial favor. The emperor raised a monument to the memory of Schall, to whose office and honors *Verbiest*, a Netherlander, succeeded. The consideration in which the Jesuits were already held was greatly augmented by a fortunate combination of circumstances. Verbiest encouraged the emperor's love of science by teaching him mathematics, and rendered important service to the whole nation by the invention of an effective cannon. Again, the Jesuit Father *Gerbillon* placed the Chinese government under lasting obligations by his successful negotiation of a peace between China and Russia in 1689. As the missionaries grew in favor, the Christians increased in number; and though these apostolic laborers were few, they could then count twenty thousand of their converts within the country.[1] Louis XIV. sent a reinforcement of six Jesuits, all of them skillful mathematicians, and in 1692 the missionaries were legally authorized to preach the Gospel throughout the whole of the Celestial Empire.

In America[2] the limited intelligence of the Indian was a very serious obstacle in the way of the rapid spread of Christianity. In spite of the formal decision of Pope Paul III., in 1537, declaring that, as *rational* beings, the Indians should be deprived of neither their possessions nor their freedom, their claims to be entitled to the rights or to be endowed with the *dignity of men* was not unfrequently called in question.[3] It must, however, be frankly admitted that the Dominicans, who were chiefly Spaniards, no longer exhibited the zeal which had characterized the earlier missionaries of their Order in these countries. The Jesuits, on the contrary, frightened by no obstacles, displayed all the ardent energy of a youthful Order. Six of their number, of whom *Emmanuel Nobriga*

[1] Others say there were one hundred thousand Christians in China at the death of Father Schall. *Mailly*, Histoire générale de la Chine. (Tr.)

[2] See Vol. II., p. 1062 sq.

[3] *Robertson*, History of America (Germ. tr., by *Fred. von Schiller*, Lps. 1777, 2 vols.); particularly Book VIII., but chiefly Noticias secretas de America por Don *J. Juan* y Don *Ant. de Ulloa*, sacadas a luz por Don Dav. *Barry*, London, 1826. *Wittmann*, Vol. I., p. 18 sq. *Prescott*, Hist. of the Conquest of Mexico, 3 vols., London and New York, 1843; Conquest of Peru, 2 vols., 1847. †**Margraf*, The Church and Slavery since the Discovery of America, Tuebg. 1865.

Hosted by Google

was one, set out for *Brazil* in 1549. Having rapidly acquired a knowledge of the language of the country, they prevailed upon the savage and ferocious inhabitants, who were accustomed to feast upon the flesh of their slaughtered enemies, and to give themselves over to every sort of excess, to accept the severe teachings and to practise the chaste morality of Christianity. For the benefit of these converts, an episcopal see was established at *San Salvador* in 1551.

The most important of the Jesuit missions in America, however, was that of *Paraguay*,[1] which, lying along the banks of the La Plata, was discovered by the Spaniards in the year 1516, by whom it was formally taken possession of in 1536. The first attempts to convert the natives, made by the Franciscans between the years 1580 and 1582, were only partially successful. In 1586 the Jesuits landed in the province of

[1] *Muratori*, Il Cristianesimo felice nelle missioni del Paraguai, Ven. 1743, 4to. *Charlevoix*, Hist. du Parag., Par. 1765, 3 T.; 4to; Germ. tr., Vienna, 1834, 2 vols. *Wittmann*, Vol. I., pp. 29–117. *Montesquieu*, L'esprit des lois, liv. IV., chap. 6, says: "Another example (of that extraordinary character in the institutions of Greece, viz., of their acting on the principle that people who live under a popular government should be trained up to virtue) we have from Paraguay. This has been made the subject of an invidious charge against a Society that considers the pleasure of commanding as the only happiness in life; but it will ever be a glorious undertaking *to render government subservient to human happiness.*

"It is glorious, indeed, for this Society to have been the first in pointing out to those countries the idea of religion joined with that of humanity. By repairing the devastations of the Spaniards, she has begun to heal one of the most dangerous wounds that the human species ever received.

"An exquisite sensibility to whatever she distinguishes by the name of honor, joined to her zeal for a religion which is far more humbling in respect to those who receive than to those who preach its doctrines, has set her upon vast undertakings, which she has accomplished with success. She has drawn wild people from their woods, secured them a maintenance, and clothed their nakedness; and had she only by this step improved the industry of mankind, it would have been sufficient to eternize her fame." (This extract is from "*The Spirit of Laws*," by Baron de Montesquieu, transl. by *Thos. Nugent*, LL.D., and published by Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati, 1873.) A similar declaration was rendered by *Chateaubriand*, who had seen Indian life in America. He says: "The Reductions formed amongst themselves those famous Christian republics, which are, as it were, a relic of antiquity in the New World. They confirmed under our own eyes the great truth recognized by Greece and Rome, that men can not be truly civilized and empires be solidly established by the shallow opinions of worldly wisdom, but only by the aid of religion."

Hosted by Google

Tucuman, and, by their zeal and ability, accomplished what their predecessors had been unable to perform. Turning to account their knowledge of history and of human nature, they adopted the policy followed by the missionaries of the Middle Ages among the Germans, identifying the conversion of the people with their political advancement, the development of the resources of the country, and the cultivation of the soil, thus from Christian parishes gradually forming an independent state. Philip III., King of Spain, authorized the Jesuits to conduct the administration, both civil and religious, on their own plan, and commissioned them, if they wished, to exclude all Spaniards from the *Reductions* of the Order. Their docile neophytes were soon trained to habits of industry, some becoming ordinary laborers, and others skilled workmen. But it was also necessary to defend themselves against the attacks of hostile neighboring tribes, and for this purpose small arms and parks of artillery were provided. In this way the habits of family-life and the usages of civilized communities were gradually introduced. The execution of the laws was committed to religious brotherhoods, the Jesuits reserving to themselves the privilege of serving the sick. The extensive knowledge of medicine possessed by the Fathers, and their ingenious and prudent charity during seasons of terrible epidemic, which occurred at frequent intervals, greatly facilitated their spiritual dominion over the hearts and souls of the natives. Unhappily, a misunderstanding between them and Bishop *Bernardine de Cardenas*, in 1640, and *John Palafox*, Bishop of Angelopolis, in 1647, gave a rude shock to the prosperity of the new State. Charges the most improbable were brought against the Jesuits, who were accused of having no higher object in view than to secure for themselves the treasures of Paraguay. The neighboring missions of the province of *Chiquitos* were no less prosperous than those of Paraguay. Even at the present day the expulsion of the Jesuits from those missions calls forth feelings of sincere regret, and has unquestionably retarded for centuries the progress of Indo-American civilization.[1]

[1] *Bach* (for twenty years a resident of South America), The Jesuits and their Mission of Chiquitos, in South America, published by *Kriegh*, Lps. 1843.

Hosted by Google

The progress of Christianity in *Africa* was incomparably slower than in America, the missionary labors of the *Capuchins* being confined to the Portuguese settlements of *Mozambique*, *Monomotapa*, and *Quiloa* on the eastern, and of *Congo*, *Angola*, *Benguela*, *Cacongo*, and *Loango*, on the western side of the *Continent;* and to the French settlements on the *Isle de Bourbon* and *Isle de France.*[1] The lack of success in these missions is mainly attributable to the ferocious barbarism and shocking immorality of the natives and to the unhealthiness of the climate.

§ 350. *Theological Science in the Catholic Church.*

† *Werner*, Hist. of Apologetical and Controversial Literature,[2] Vol. IV. By the *same*, Hist. of Catholic Theology, from the Council of Trent to our own Day, Munich, 1866. *Du Pin*, Nouvelle Biblioth. des auteurs eccl. *Richard Simon*, Hist. crit. des principaux commentateurs. Notices concerning celebrated post-Tridentine Theologians, in "*The Catholic*," years 1863, 1864, 1865, and 1866, revised ed. by *Hurter*, Nomenclator literarius recentioris theologiae, Oeniponti, 1871 sq., Fasc. 1–4. The principal works of this epoch, and particularly on *Dogma* and *Exegesis*, reprinted at Paris, in *Migne*, Cursus completus theologiae, 28 vols., and likewise sacrae scripturae, 29 vols., 4to.

Historical facts have all a more or less intimate connection with each other. The disturbance caused by any great movement extends in every direction, producing everywhere more or less agitation. Consonant with this law, the struggle against Protestantism, the founding of new Religious Orders, and the controversies that broke out in the very bosom of the Church, were the occasion, if not the cause, of that remarkable and very decided activity in theological science so characteristic of this epoch. It now became evident to Catholic theologians that if they would successfully repel the assaults of Protestants they must give special attention to the study of *dogmatics*, and to this they seriously applied themselves, not as formerly from a speculative point of view, but mainly

[1] *Külb*, Voyages of Missionaries to Africa, from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century, Ratisbon, 1861.

[2] In this work of *Werner's* we have at length obtained a comprehensive and clear idea of the *controversy* started by Luther and Zwinglius, and carried on by their Protestant followers against Catholics.

Hosted by Google

in connection with historical facts, an alliance which had now become more necessary than ever before, in view of the peculiar tactics adopted by the pretended reformers. The contributions of the *Jesuits* to theological science were invaluable, though the other Religious Orders were equally active, and their labors equally useful. The eminent services of *Melchior Canus* were very justly the pride of the Spanish Dominicans. He was selected by the University of Salamanca, on account of his extraordinary ability, to represent that famous seat of learning at the Council of Trent, where he became distinguished even among that celebrated body of eminent divines († 1560). His best known work is that entitled *De Locis Theologicis*, in twelve books, being an admirable introduction to the study of dogmatic theology. It contains very useful researches on the sources, the importance, and the utility of dogmatic theology; of its relations to other branches of science, and of the application of philosophy to theology.[1] The characteristics of the work are deep and vigorous thought, great originality, and terseness and energy of expression.

Denys Petau (*Petavius*), of Orléans, was, beyond all question, the most learned theologian the Society of Jesus produced. His works are of such solidity and depth, and withal so complete, that any one desirous to make a serious study of theology must necessarily consult them. Apart from his labors in publishing the works of many historical and philosophical writers, as for instance those of Epiphanius, of Synesius, of Nicephorus, and of the Emperor Julian, and his own work on history and astronomy, entitled *Rationale Temporum*, which of itself formed an epoch in literature, his celebrated book, known as *Theologica Dogmata*,[2] attracted universal attention. It was intended that this work should be a complete exposition of the teachings professed everywhere and at all times by the Catholic Church, in contradistinction to the changing creeds of heretics. Unfortunately, the premature death of the author, in 1652, prevented its completion. It

[1] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., s. v. Canus; apud *Werner*, Hist. of Apol., etc., Vol. IV. Good ed., Padua, 1762.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 20, note 1.

Hosted by Google

seems a marvel that the short space of a single life should have been sufficient to accomplish labors so considerable, in a manner so exact and conscientious, and in every way so remarkable. The Latinity of Father Petau is easy and graceful, and his expositions clear and methodical. Combining, in a comprehensive and masterly way, the sciences of history and dogmatics, he was the first to treat successfully dogmatic teaching from an historical point of view; while his intimate knowledge of Platonic philosophy enabled him to correct the numerous errors of the Fathers of the Church in regard to Plato's teachings.

In the controversies which the Protestant revolt necessarily occasioned, *Eck*,[1] *Cochlaeus*, *Emser*, *Faber*, *Erasmus*, *Gropper*, *Pighius*, and *Stanislaus Hosius* became very justly distinguished. Mention should also be made of the excellent work entitled "*German Theology*," published at Münster, in 1528, by the humble and saintly *Berthold*, Bishop of Chiemsee. Its object was announced to be "to supply authentic information to a deluded people, and to point out what was to be received as certain truth, and on what grounds." This little work, whether considered from a *grammatical* or *theological* point of view, is one of the most interesting of controversial writings in the whole of the Catholic literature of Germany.[2] Mention should also be made of the labors of *John Nas* (1534–1590), of the Order of St. Francis, and Auxiliary Bishop of Brixen, which were, in their way, very important.[3]

But of all the theologians of this age, the most eminent beyond comparison was *Robert Bellarmine*, who was born at Montepulciano, in Tuscany, October 4, 1542, and entered the Society of Jesus in 1560. Extremely severe toward himself, an enemy to all indulgence, and an indefatigable worker, he left behind him writings so numerous and valuable that no better evidence of the holiness and self-sacrifice of his life

[1] Enchiridion locorum communium adv. Lutherum et alios hostes ecclesiae, Landeshuti, 1525.

[2] New edition, by *Reithmeier*, Munich, 1852. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. X., p. 884 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 23, p. 334 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 113–124.

[3] *Schoepf*, Joh. Nasus, etc., Bozen, 1860. Dr. *Raess*, Converts, Vol. I., p. 298 sq.

Hosted by Google

could be required. He was a successful preacher, but was especially distinguished for the ability with which he taught the various branches of theology. Having been sent to the University of Louvain by the general, Francis Borgia, to complete his theological studies, he was there appointed to a chair of theology in the year 1670, and for six or seven years continued to hold this post of honor and influence. While here he wrote a Hebrew grammar and a sort of patrology or biographical sketches of ecclesiastical writers (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*), a work which is highly esteemed even at the present day. Having been called to Rome, he again taught theology for twelve consecutive years, and there composed a work on Controversies, the full title of which is *Disputationes de controversis Christianae fidei articulis, libri IV.*[1] He was intimately acquainted with all the literature of Protestantism. The works of Luther, Melanchthon, Beza, Calvin, of the Socinians, and in fact of all the enemies of the Church, were familiar to him. The various points in controversy and the true state of every question were set forth by him with precision and judicial fairness. In his exegetics he gave, as a rule, a brief statement of the points which he intended either to develop or refute. His demonstrations, based upon tradition, are unusually full and satisfactory. Of his exegetical works, his commentary on the Psalms deserves special mention, it being remarkable for lucidity and accuracy of thought, as well as for earnestness and an intelligent and sympathetic appreciation of the meaning of this portion of the Sacred Writings. This praise would be the more cordially granted to Bellarmine's Commentary, had not the author in numerous passages, where the Vulgate deviates from the Hebrew, and where the two can not be reconciled without doing violence to the original, uniformly followed the reading of the former.[2]

In 1599 he was, much against his own will, created a cardinal, but this elevation made no change in the austere habits

[1] First edition, Rome, 1581–1592, 3 vols., fol., besides many other editions; recudi curavit, *Fr. Sausen*, Mogunt, 1842 sq.; a favorite ed. is that of Naples, 1856–1859; Germ. transl., by *Gumposch*, Augsburg, 1842 sq. Opera omnia, ed. *Justinus Fèvre*, publ. by Louis Vivès, Paris, in 12 vols., 4to.

[2] See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., art. "Bellarmine," toward the end. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

of his life. His simple manners and incessant labors were a standing rebuke to the listless lives of the great dignitaries with whom he came in contact.

In 1602 he was appointed Archbishop of *Capua*, and in consequence was obliged to leave Rome. He remained in Capua until the year 1606, when he was relieved of his pastoral charge by Paul V. During his stay there he wrote an excellent *catechism* and a work addressed to his nephew, entitled "*Admonitio ad Episcopum Theanensem, etc.*," which of itself is an ample proof of the energy and conscientiousness with which he applied himself to the discharge of his new functions. Finally, his deep and sincere piety and his humble resignation to the will of God are abundantly attested in his ascetical works, entitled "*De ascensione mentis in Deum per scalas rerum creatarum*" and "*De gemitu columbae, seu de bono lacrymarum, etc.*" He died September 17, 1621.

During the same period *Peter Canisius* rendered a signal service to both clergy and laity by the publication, in 1554, of a Larger and a Smaller Catechism. The former was a compendium of Christian doctrine, bearing the title "*Summa doctrinae Christianae* (*Catechismus major*); and the latter, an abridgment of the former, published in 1561, and having the title "*Institutiones Christianae, sive parvus catechismus Catholicorum.*" A still shorter edition of this abridgment was published for the use of children. It was not long before the "*Summa*" was translated into every living language. The edition published at Paris in 1686, by the authority of the archbishop, enumerates more than four hundred previously issued. It is said that it was largely instrumental in converting numerous Protestants.[1] Even the Roman Catechism (*Catechismus Romanus ad parochos*), published in 1566, which is a repository of all kinds of information needful to clergymen in giving religious instruction, did not supersede that of Canisius.[2] The style of the Roman Catechism, which is clear and elegant, is

[1] *Riess*, Life of Blessed Peter Canisius, ch. III., p. 109–125.

[2] Catech. romanus ex decreto Conc. Trid. ad ed. *principem* Manutianam a. 1566, ed. *Ritter*, Vrat. 1837; ed. *Smets*, Lat. et Germ., Bielef. 1844 sq.; ed. Rom. 1845. Catechism of the Council of Trent, trans. by *J. Donovan*, Dublin, 1829; Baltimore, 1829.

Hosted by Google

mainly the work of the celebrated linguist, *Paul Manutius*, who revised the manuscript after it came from the hands of its authors, who were three Dominicans. This work having been written by order of the Council of Trent, became, like the synodal decrees themselves, a sort of Rule of Faith. Minor controversial works were also written at this period by the Jesuits, *Gregory of Valencia* (*Analysis fidei Catholicae*, † 1603), *Francis Coster* (*Enchiridion controversiarum nostri temporis*, † 1619), and *Martin Becanus* (*Manuale controvers., libb. V.*), those of the last two being highly esteemed. Becanus was also the author of an *Analogia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, in which he shows the harmony between the two. Valuable works were written on particular dogmas of faith, and the Jansenists, *Nicole* and *Arnauld*, gained quite a name by the ability with which they defended the Blessed Eucharist and the Sacrament of Penance against the attacks of the Reformers, in their work *Perpétuité de la foi catholique.*

In lands like *Spain*, which lay at a distance from the turbulent scenes of the Reformation, the study of *mediaeval* philosophy and theology, particularly that of St. Thomas, was revived, and calm and systematic expositions given of the principal teachings of the Church. The ablest representative of this theological tendency was the Jesuit, *Suarez* († 1617), who taught philosophy and theology successively at Segovia, Valladolid, Alcalà, Salamanca, Rome, and Coimbra (in Portugal). He was also well versed in many of the sciences, though his method of treating them in the lecture-room lacked conciseness and directness.[1] Other members of the Order, however, notably *Maldonatus* and *Possevin*, achieved a certain measure of success in their efforts to simplify the science of theology.[2]

So much of the thought of this age was given to the discussion of dogmatic teachings that comparatively little attention was bestowed on the study of *moral theology*. It was not,

[1] † * *Werner*, Francis Suarez, and the Scholasticism of the last Centuries, Ratisbon, 1861, 2 vols. Works, 23 vols., fol., Lyons, 1603 sq., Mentz, 1612 sq., Antwerp, 1614 sq., Venice, 1740; new ed., in 28 vols., sm. 4to, by *Louis Vivès*, Paris, 1856, 1872. Summa, seu compendium, by *Fr. Noël*, S. J., 2 vols., fol., Genev. 1732, Paris, 1861. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Possevin*, Bibliotheca selecta, Colon, 1607, pp. 120–130.

Hosted by Google

however, wholly neglected; and, as in the preceding age, the efforts in this direction took the form either of scholasticism and casuistry, or of mysticism and asceticism. Besides the treatises of *Erasmus* and *Juan Luis Vivès*, the labors of those *Jesuits* who wrote on special portions of moral theology deserve separate mention. It will be sufficient to enumerate the names of *Toletus* († 1596), *Vasquez* († 1604), *Laymann* († 1635), *Escobar* († 1669), and *Busenbaum* († 1668), whose work, entitled *Medulla theologiae moralis facili ac perspicua methodo resolvens casus conscientiae, etc.*, *Monast.* 1645, was extensively used. We shall again have occasion to refer to the mystical and ascetical writers who treated of moral theology. Unfortunately, the theory of "*Probabilism*," started in the year 1572 by *Bartholomew Medina*, a Dominican, was introduced into the schools of theology, and gave rise to a series of propositions of a lax and demoralizing tendency. The theory was ably controverted by some of the most celebrated professors, and strongly opposed by the ecclesiastical authorities, who demanded that the *limits* within which it might be safely applied should be clearly and precisely defined. To correct this theory, others were started, which gradually came to be known as "*Aequiprobabilism*," "*Probabiliorism*," and "*Tutiorism*."

During this period the study of exegetics was stimulated by the instructions given by the Council of Trent in its Fifth Session on Reformation; by the aids which the Complutensian *Polyglot* Bible afforded; by the labors of such Hebrew grammarians and lexicographers as *Pelican*, *Bellarmine*, and, pre-eminently, *Santes Pagninus* († 1541), who was the author of a Hebrew dictionary and a method for interpreting Holy Scripture;[1] and, finally, by the movement set on foot by *Erasmus*. To all these causes is to be ascribed the great advance made in Biblical studies during these years. An introduction to the study of Sacred Scripture, was written by the Dominican, *Sixtus of Siena* († 1569),[2] which, like the *Antwerp polyglot* (1569), mainly prepared by *Montanus*, and *Lejay's*

[1] Isagoge ad sacras literas lib. unus; Isagoge ad mysticos sacr. scripturae sensus, lib. 18, Colon. 1540, fol.

[2] Bibliotheca sancta, ex praecipuis cathol. ecclesiae auctorib. collecta, etc.

Hosted by Google

Paris polyglot (1645), which in syntactical accuracy and general literary merit is superior to the former, is very valuable as an aid to obtain a correct understanding of the text. On the other hand, the *rigorous principles* then prevalent *concerning the inspiration of the Sacred Books* was a serious hindrance to the progress of exegetical studies. Starting with the principle that every word of Holy Writ had been, literally speaking, inspired by God, the commentators were forced to put subtile interpretations upon the text, which, while they might be learned and ingenious, were frequently very wide of the truth.

The most conspicuous opponents of this rigid rule of interpretation were the Jesuits, *Hamel* and *Lessius*, of Louvain, who contended that for a book to be divine and canonical required neither textual inspiration nor even that of every thought; and that a book, like the Second of Maccabees, which is, they said, a purely human production, might be regarded as canonical, provided the Holy Ghost should, after its composition, become a witness to the entire truth of its contents. These opinions, as soon as published, were very justly assailed by the theological faculties of Louvain and Douai, and condemned by the bishops of Belgium. The matter was brought by Pope Sixtus V. before his own tribunal. He put off giving a decision till the disputants should return to a better temper; and, after a time, a moderate judgment, based upon the teachings of the best interpreters of the *School of Antioch*, and notably upon those of St. John Chrysostom, was adopted. It was not long before a number of Catholic exegetical writers published works in refutation of the exclusive and one-sided interpretations of the Reformers. Cardinal *Cajetan* gave his entire life to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, and his ingenious and strikingly original interpretations abundantly prove that he possessed talents specially qualifying him for the task.[1] Nevertheless, his works have been severely criticized, mainly on *philological* grounds, by Melchior Canus and others. A translation of the Bible, made by *Va-*

Venet. 1566, fol.; Frcf. 1575, fol.; Col. 1626, 4to; ibid. 1686, in fol.; Neap. 1742, in fol., 2 vols.; liber III. contains Ars interpretandi sacras scripturas absolutissima; separate edition, Colon. 1577, 1588, in 8vo. His Life, by Father *Milante*.

[1] Commentarii in V. et N. T., Lugd. 1639, 5 T., fol.

Hosted by Google

table († 1547), during the reign of Francis I., has gone through many editions, chiefly on account of the clear and concise remarks added by him to explain the text. It should be added, however, that the work has not escaped censure.[1] The commentary on Josue by *Andrew Masius* was pronounced by Richard Simon, the celebrated critic, a master-piece of grammatical and historical interpretation. Masius, who assisted in editing the Antwerp polyglot, was the equal of Cajetan as an exegetical writer, and his superior in philological attainments. Cardinal *Sadolet*, Bishop of Carpentras († 1547), who was the author of many works on philosophy, made an attempt to harmonize the various Protestant Confessions with the teachings of the Church, and with the same view published *a commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, whence the Protestants had drawn the bulk of the arguments in support of their teachings. Written in the form of a dialogue, and in elegant Ciceronian Latin, it was in a large measure successful. *Gaspar Contarini*, also a cardinal, and thoroughly conversant with the Greek commentators, published brief and valuable annotations on the Epistles of St. Paul († 1542).

Claude d'Espence, a doctor of the Sorbonne († 1571), was also the author of excellent commentaries, in which he made it a point to tell some wholesome truths to popes, bishops, and the clergy in general. *Jansenius*, Bishop of Ghent († 1576), who seems to have been the forerunner of Hamel and Lessius, published a valuable *Concordance of the Gospels*. *Agellio*, Bishop of Acerno, in the kingdom of Naples († 1608), *Bellarmine*, and *Simon de Muis* wrote excellent commentaries on the Psalms.

The Jesuit, *Jacques Bonfrère*, professor at Douai († 1643), wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, which is highly thought of, even at the present day. *Prado* († 1595), *Villalpando* († 1608), and *Ribera*, all Jesuits, published very good commentaries, the two former on Ezechiel,[2] and the last on the

[1] Of the many editions of this work, the best is that brought out by Nicole Henri, Paris, 1729 and 1745.

[2] *J. B. Villalpandi* et *H. Pradi* in Ezechielem explanationes et apparatus urbis ac templi Hierosolymitani commentariis et imaginibus illustratus, Romae, 1596–1606, 3 vols., fol. max. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Twelve Minor Prophets and the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews. Those on Ezechiel are, however, not so highly esteemed as those of *Christopher de Castro*, *Vieira*, and *Aliazar* on the Apocalypse. The commentaries of *Pineda* on the book of Job, and of *Gaspar Sanctius* († 1628) on nearly all the books of the Old Testament, are wearisomely prolix. *Tullianus* wrote commentaries on the two books of the Maccabees. The moral, allegorical, and anagogical explanations in the celebrated work of *Cornelius a Lapide* (Van den Steen, † 1637) are also very lengthy, his best commentaries being those on the *Pentateuch* and the Epistles of *St. Paul.* The admirable quotations from the Fathers give the work a special value. It is, however, advisable to verify these extracts by reference to their originals.[1] The work of Father *Mersenne*, a member of the Order of St. Francis of Paula, entitled Celebrated Questions on Genesis (*Questiones celebres in Genesin*, 1623), is original in the treatment of the subject, and attests the author's proficiency in mathematics. Had he been more conversant with laws of meteorology and of the physical sciences in general, he would not have committed the blunder of attacking the system of *Copernicus*, Canon of Frauenburg († 1643). The attitude of Rome toward Copernicus and *Galileo* († 1638), incomparably more liberal to science than that assumed by the Protestant churches from the first moment of their existence,[2] and dishonestly and persistently misrepresented, has been in our own day fully investigated, with the aid of authentic documents, and triumphantly vindicated.[3]

[1] New edition, Melitae, 1842–1852, 10 T., 4to, and Parisiis, 1866–1868, 24 vols., sm. 4to (Louis Vivès, publisher). (Tr.)

[2] See § 338, page 310, of this volume.

[3] "The Holy See versus *Galileo Galilei*, and the Astronomical System of *Copernicus*." (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., in four articles.) *Bonn Review*, new series, year IV., nro. 2, p. 118 sq. *Deschamps*, The Truth and Reasonableness of Faith (Germ. rev. ed., by *Heinrich*, Mentz, 1857). See *Aschbach's* and the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., article "*Galilei.*" The famous dictum "*E pur si muove*," or "And yet it (the earth) does move," was first invented at the end of the eighteenth century, as has been shown by the mathematician, *Heis*, in the periodical "*Gaea*," year 1868. Besides numberless writings, which have appeared lately in Italian, French, German, and English, we have received that by *Gebler*, Galileo Galilei and the Roman Court, according to authentic sources, Stuttgart, 1876. Cfr. La condamnation de Galilée, etc., in the Quarterly "*Revue des Questions scientifiques*," Louvain, April, 1877. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

The Jesuits, *Tirinus* and *Menochius* († 1655), published brief explanations of the whole of the Sacred Text, which were favorably received, and remained long in use. We must also mention here the commentaries of *Francis Toletus* on the Epistle to the Romans, the Gospel of St. Luke, and particularly on the doctrinal passages of the Gospel of St. John; the questions and dissertations of *Alphonsus Salmeron* († 1585), in 16 vols., fol., on nearly the whole of the New Testament; and the commentaries of the Jesuit, *Lorinus* († 1634), on the books of Numbers and Leviticus and on the Psalms; also on the Acts of the Apostles and on the Catholic Epistles.

The works already mentioned, though each has its own merit, are not to be compared with the productions of the three following exegetical writers. The first two are profitably consulted, even in our own day, and the last, though less known, is not inferior to either of them as a commentator. These are: 1. The Jesuit, Father *John Maldonatus*, who was born in Estremadura in 1534, completed his studies with unusual distinction at Salamanca, and was an excellent Greek and Hebrew scholar and a fine historian. After teaching Greek, philosophy, and theology for some time at Salamanca, he entered the Society of Jesus in 1562, and, taking up his residence in Paris, was there appointed to a professorship. His lectures on the *Four Gospels*, which were published only after his death, by Fronto le Duc, at Pont-à-Mousson, in 1596, are his most remarkable productions. As in the case of Abelard, so numerous were the crowds that flocked to hear him, that, unable to accommodate them in any of the great lecture-rooms of Paris, he was obliged to speak in the court of the college. It was in consequence of his able debate at Sedan with a Calvinist minister that the Duke de Bouillon was converted to the Catholic faith. He died at Rome in 1583, shortly after having received a commission from Pope Gregory XIII. to assist in editing a new edition of the Septuagint. 2. *William Estius*, Chancellor of the University of Douai, had such facility in explaining the most difficult passages of Holy Scripture, and notably those contained in the *Epistles of the Apostles*, that his lecture-room was filled with hearers desirous of profiting by his learning. Inferior to Maldonatus as an

Hosted by Google

historian and philologist, he was his superior in depth of penetration and in ability to grasp and draw out the drift and sequence of thought in the apostolic writings.[1] 3. Father *Justiniani*, also a *Jesuit*, was the author of a commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. So learned are the paraphrases, so luminous the dissertations, and so extensive and accurate the erudition contained in this work, that though less known than that of Estius, it is equally valuable, and has not attracted the attention it deserves.[2]

We should mention, finally, the numerous translations of the Bible made during this epoch into the various European languages. In *Germany* alone, not to speak of other countries, a translation of the New Testament by *Emser* was published in 1527, and in 1534 and 1537 translations of the whole Bible by *Dietenberger* and *Eck*, and still later by *Ulenberg* († 1617), all of which were works of unusual merit. Translations of the entire Bible were published in Poland by the Jesuit, *James Wujek*, and in France by *Véron* and others.

With a view to combating Protestantism with its own weapons, *Leisentritt*, Dean of the Chapter of Budissin, published in 1573 a large collection of *sacred songs* and an *Agenda* or Liturgy *in German*. A still larger collection of sacred songs was published in 1631 by *Corner*, prior of the Benedictine monastery of Göttweih.

Owing to the pretensions put forward by their opponents, the Catholics were obliged to show by *historical* evidence that the teaching and discipline of the Church were based upon *Apostolic* tradition and the belief of the primitive Christians. The assumptions of Protestants were successfully refuted by the Catholic historians of the period, of whom the following

[1] A new edition of the commentaries of *Maldonatus* and *Estius* was recently published by *Sausen*, Mogunt. 1841 sq. A third edition of Maldonatus was edited by Bishop *Martin*, Mogunt. 1862; a fourth by Dr. *J. M. Raich*, Mogunt. 1874. (Tr.) The second edition of Estius, revised by *Holzammer*, Mogunt. 1858 sq. Maldonatus also wrote a commentary on the prophets Jeremias, Baruch, Ezechiel, and Daniel; and a full explanation on Ps. CIX., and scholia or the Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Isaias. See *Dixon*, Introd. to the S. Script., Vol. II., p. 226 (Tr.), and cf. *J. M. Prat*, S. J., *Maldonat* et l'université de Paris au XVIe siècle, Par. 1857.

[2] Ed. Lugduni, 1611–1614, 3 T., f.

Hosted by Google

are the best known: *Baronius* and his continuators;[1] *Peter de Marca*, Archbishop elect of Paris († 1662), whose controversies in defense of the episcopal system are well known (*De concordia imperii et sacerdotii*); Cardinal *du Perron* († 1618), who wrote his *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* against *Richer*, and in support of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; *Panvinio*, an Augustinian, who wrote a History of the Popes († 1568); and *Lawrence Surius*, a Carthusian, of Cologne, and a convert († 1578), whose versatile talents adorned nearly every branch of literature. His Lives of the Saints, in six folio volumes,[2] stimulated the *Bollandists*, whose centenary labors were begun in the year 1643, to make a more exhaustive use of the precious materials within their reach.[3]

Finally, the *ascetical writings* of the epoch, which were, as a rule, the productions of men occupied with other labors, strikingly illustrate the beneficent influence of the Middle Ages upon Catholic literature. Chief among these are the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius, which have been mainly instrumental in preserving in the Society which he founded the pious and profitable habit of meditation. Edifying lives of St. Ignatius and St. Francis Xavier were written by *Maffei* and *Tursellinus*. Numerous works on *pastoral theology*, the outgrowth of the renewed and vigorous religious life then setting in, were also published, of some of which particular mention should be made. The most important are *Ecclesiastes, seu concionator evangelicus*, by *Erasmus*; *Instructiones confessariorum et concionatorum*, by *St. Charles Borromeo*; *Rhetorica ecclesiastica*, libri III., by *Valerius Augustine*; a work of the same title, by *Louis of Granada*, a Dominican; but, above all, the works published by the celebrated preachers of this age. Of these, the greatest names in Italy were *Clarius*, Bishop of Fuligno; *Cornelius Musso*, Bishop of Bitonto, in the kingdom of Naples († 1574); *Charles Borromeo*; and the Jesuit, *Paul Segneri* († 1694). In France, *Simon Vigor*, Archbishop of Narbonne († 1575); the Jesuit, *Claude de Lingendes*

[1] See Vol. I., p. 44.

[2] Edited Cologne, 1570 sq., 1576–1581; Suppl. Vol. VII., by *F. J. Mosander*, ibid., 1586; best ed., ibid., 1618, in 12 vols.

[3] See Vol. I., page 23, note 4.

Hosted by Google

(† 1666); his kinsman, *John de Lingendes;* and *Francis Férault*, of the Oratory († 1670). In Spain, *John of Avila*, the Apostle of Andalusia, and *Louis of Granada;* and in Poland, *Peter Skarga* and *Birkowski.*

Besides the ascetical works published in Germany, of which we have already spoken,[1] the faith and piety of the age were revived and sustained by the writings of *St. Teresa*, *St. John of the Cross*, the pious *Louis of Granada*, *St. Francis de Sales* (Philothea and Letters to People Living in the World), *Lawrence Scupuli* (Spiritual Combat), *Bellarmine*, *Alphonsus Rodriguez* (The Practice of Christian Perfection), *Louis da Ponte* (Meditations on the Mysteries of Faith), *M. Olier*, founder of the Congregation of St. Sulpice († 1657—Catechism of Interior Life), and *Condren*, second superior-general of the French Oratory († 1641—Idea of the True Priesthood of J. C.)

When Louis of Granada presented to Gregory XIII. copies of "The Sinner's Guide," and "Christian Life," of his excellent Catechism and his treatise on prayer, the Pope expressed his delight in words which must have been extremely gratifying to the pious author. "You have," said the Holy Father, "done a greater service to those who may seek instruction in your pages, than if by prayer you had restored sight to the blind or brought the dead to life." We need not marvel, then, why these works have been so frequently reproduced in our own day, why they have been translated into so many languages, or why so much pains is taken to issue correct and serviceable editions of them.

§ 351. *New Controversies on Grace—Baius, Molina, Jansenius.*

The fear entertained that the extreme tenets of Protestantism, when applied to the workings of divine grace in regenerated man, and carried out to their last results, would not be without influence on Catholic divines, was verified in the case of *Michael Baius*, a professor of theology at Louvain (after 1551).[2] He was hardly seated in the professor's chair when,

[1] *Brischar*, The Cath. Pulpit Orators of Germany during the last three centuries, Schaffh. 1867 sq., 3 vols.

[2] Baji Opp., Coloniae, 1696, 4to. At the beginning of the year 1563: De libero arbitrio; de justitia; de justificatione and de sacrificio. After his return

Hosted by Google

like his colleague, *John Hessels*, he began to assail the scholastic method, and to introduce the positive. After explaining the doctrines of faith, he supported them with texts of Scripture and passages from the writings of such Fathers as St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory, but chiefly from those of *St. Augustine*. In defense of his method of teaching, he pointed out that Protestants had distorted the sense of the Sacred Text, and claimed that it was his aim to restore its true meaning. On the return of his older colleagues, *Tapper* and *Ravenstein*, from the Council of Trent, they, together with other advocates of the *scholastic* method, expressed their disapprobation of his course and their alarm as to the tendency of the *system* which he was beginning to mold into definite shape. In consequence, acting in concert with the Franciscans, they sent, in the year 1560, eighteen of the propositions of Baius' for examination to the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne.[1] As only five of the propositions were pronounced heretical and three false,[2] their author felt that he might with all propriety publish a defense of his position. In this, while freely admitting that some of the propositions were faulty, he contended that the greater number of them were correct, being, as he said, in complete harmony with the words of Holy Writ and the teachings of St. Augustine. Cardinal *Granvelle*, Archbishop of Malines and Governor of the Netherlands, anxious to put an end to a controversy which, he believed, had its origin in a misapprehension of terms and expressions not in general use among theologians, prevailed upon *Philip II.* to send the professors, Baius and John Hessels, together with Cornelius Jansenius, subsequently Bishop of Ghent, and at that time (1563) a well-known Biblical commentator, to Trent as deputies of the University. On his return, Baius published a number of Tracts, in which he defended and still further developed his

from Trent, the treatises: De meritis operum; de prima hominis justitia et de virtutibus impiorum; de sacramentis in genere, etc. Conf. *Kuhn*, s. v. Bay, in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed.; *Linsemann*, Michael Bajus, Tueb. 1867; *Scheeber*, Supplements toward a hist. of Bajanism (Catholic, March, 1868).

[1] In *d'Argentré* Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, T. II., p. 1–203, and in *du Pin*, Bibliothèque, T. XVI., p. 139 sq.

[2] *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, T. II. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

peculiar views. These publications were the occasion of a fresh controversy, during which his colleague, Hessels, died (1566).

The affair was eventually submitted to the judgment of the Holy See, and by a bull, dated October 1, 1567, *Pius V.*, without naming their author, condemned seventy-nine propositions of Baius'. The disciples of Baius refused to submit, maintaining that the condemned propositions, in the sense in which they were stated, were not to be found in the writings of their master. In consequence, the condemnation was renewed in more precise terms by *Gregory XIII.* in 1579.

In the following year, Baius sent on to Rome an act of submission, thus escaping expulsion from his office.[1] He also received at this time a copy of the bull of Pius V., which had heretofore been denied him. The condemned propositions related chiefly to original sin, free will, regenerated nature, and the relation of good works to grace, the fundamental one being *that fallen nature, destitute of divine grace, is absolutely incapable of well-doing, and, as a consequence, can not leave off evil-doing.*

In direct opposition to the definition of the Council of Trent, Baius seemed at least to hold that the Blessed Virgin was not exempt from either original or actual sin.[2] The system of Baius, which spread rapidly, was vehemently assailed by the Jesuit Fathers, *Leonard Lessius* and *John Hamel*, members of the Faculty of Louvain, whose zeal apparently got the better of their judgment, and carried them to the opposite extreme. Hence thirty-four of *their* propositions, which the partisans of Baius claimed had the flavor of Semi-Pelagianism, were disclaimed in 1587 by the Theological Faculty of Louvain. With a view of promoting good will between the two parties, *Sixtus V.*, in the following year, commanded both to abstain from mutual recriminations.

Unfortunately, about this time a work appeared in Spain, written by the Jesuit, *Louis Molina*, and bearing the title

[1] This bull is also found in the stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, Lps. 1842, p. 273–278. *Du Chesne*, Hist. du Bajanisme, Douai, 1731, 4to. Conférences d'Angers sur la grâce, Paris, 1789.

[2] *Werner*, Fr. Suarez, Vol. I., pp. 380 sq.

Hosted by Google

"*Liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione concordia*," which at once revived the controversy between the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans*.[1] The former defended the teaching of Scotus; the latter that of St. Augustine. The Molinists, in recommendation of their doctrine, said *that if what is understood to be rigorous Augustinianism were to be accepted, the tenets of the Reformers could not be easily refuted.*

Desirous, if possible, to harmonize the two systems, Molina maintained that by his own natural powers man may in some sort contribute toward his conversion and the performance of good works. In support of this position, he brought forward the teaching of *Fonseca*, who had been his master, on the so-called *mediate* knowledge of God (*Scientia Dei media*), which is, that God foresees such future events as would take place if certain given conditions, which are never fulfilled, were carried out; as, for example, the instances in 1 Samuel, xxiii. 11 sq., and Matthew, xi. 21.

Molina's book was attacked by the Dominicans, *Alvarez* and *Thomas de Lemos*, who upheld the Thomist system, maintaining that grace influences the free consent of the will, the latter bearing the relation to the former of physical effect to physical cause. Preserving the analogy, the agency of grace is called physical premotion or predetermination. The Jesuits, *Gregory of Valencia*, *Arrubal*, *La Bastide*, *Toletus*, and others, came to the defense of Molina, whereupon Pope Clement VIII., at the request of both parties, solicited the advice of the bishops, universities, and theologians, and established at Rome, in 1699, the celebrated Congregation "*De Auxiliis*,"[2] to determine the question concerning the relation of divine grace to man's conversion. Clement died before a decision was arrived at, and his successor, Paul V., continued the examination till the year 1607, when he suspended the labors of the Congregation, reserving to himself the right of making known the result at some future day, and (probably at the

[1] It appeared first at Lisbon, 1588; then, enlarged, at Antwerp, 1595. Cf. *Werner*, St. Thomas of Aquino, Vol. III., p. 389–430.

[2] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. II., pp. 786–794; Fr. trans., Vol. 5., pp. 194–203.

Hosted by Google

instance of Baronius) permitting both parties to hold their opinions, and prohibiting each from accusing their adversaries of heresy.

The prohibition, though renewed by Urban VIII., Innocent X., and Innocent XI., was not unfrequently disregarded in the heat of controversy by the representatives of both parties. The system of Molina, which was more or less Pelagian in tendency, was modified by the Jesuits into what is known as *Congruism* (*Gratia congrua et incongrua*). This system, which is quite different from pure Molinism, was perfected some time later by the celebrated Jesuits, *Suarez* and *Vasquez*.[1] According to Molinism, the *free consent* of the will is the *sole* and *only* condition to the action of grace; whereas, according to Congruism, the action of grace is dependent on the *congruity of grace* itself, and, as a consequence, on the very nature and power of grace. Hence, congruous grace (*gratia congrua*) is always efficacious (*efficax*); whereas incongruous grace (*gratia incongrua*), inasmuch as man does not correspond to it, is only sufficient (*sufficiens*). This system, *Aquaviva*, the General of the Jesuits, ordered to be taught in all the schools of the Society (1613).

The Molinist controversy was again revived by the publication of a treatise, written by *Garasse*, a Jesuit, and assailed by *John Duvergier*, who subsequently became Abbot of St. Cyran. *Cornelius Jansenius*, a friend of Duvergier's, then a professor at Louvain, and afterward Bishop of Ypres († 1638), undertook to examine the whole Augustinian system of grace, embodying the results of his labors in a work entitled "*Augustinus*." In the preface to this book, as also in his last will, he declared that *he submitted the work to the judgment of the Holy See*.[2] The work is divided into three parts, in the first of which the author professes to show the points of contact and agreement between the teachings of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians and those of the Molinists; in the second, he points out that reason alone is not sufficient to give a knowl-

[1] *Hortig*, Ch. Hist., continued by *Döllinger*, Vol. II., pp. 810 sq.

[2] Augustinus, seu doctrina Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adv. Pelagianos et Massilienses, Lovanii, 1640; Parisiis, 1641, and frequently.

Hosted by Google

edge of the doctrine of grace, which must be sought in Holy Scripture, in the writings of the Fathers, and in the decrees of Councils; and then goes on to speak of the condition of man before and after the Fall; finally, in the third, he speaks of man's conversion, which, he says, is accomplished by *the irresistible action of grace, man of himself being absolutely helpless to contribute anything toward it.*

The publication of the work was opposed by the Jesuits, on the ground that it contained Calvinistic errors on predestination. This remonstrance was fruitless, and the author being already dead, a first edition of it appeared at Louvain in 1640, and a second in the following year, containing an approbation from the doctors of the *Sorbonne.* A violent controversy at once broke out.

The Jesuits made a collection of the suspected propositions, giving special prominence to the utterances of Jansenius against the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and their own teachings. By the bull "*In eminenti*" of 1642, Pope Urban VIII. forbade the *Augustinus* to be read. As the Jesuits were endeavoring to show that all the propositions, previously condemned by Pius V. and Gregory XIII., were clearly contained in the *Augustinus*, *Cornet*, the syndic of the Sorbonne, submitted (1649) seven propositions, taken from the writings of Jansenius, to the judgment of the Faculty, which were, in the course of the examination, reduced to *five.*[1] After considerable discussion, and frequent appeals to parliament, the propositions, some of which were literal extracts from the *Augustinus*, and

[1] I. Aliqua Dei praecepta hominibus justis, volentibus et conantibus secundum praesentes, quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia; deest illis quoque gratia, qua possibilia fiant. II. Interiori gratiae in statu naturae lapsae nunquam resistitur. III. Ad merendum et demerendum in statu naturae lapsae non requiritur in homine *libertas a necessitate* (freedom from interior necessity) sed sufficit *libertas a coactione* (from exterior constraint). IV. Semipelagiani admittebant praevenientis gratiae interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei; et in hoc erant haeretici, quod vellent eam gratiam talem esse, cui possit humana voluntas resistere vel obtemperare. V. Semipelagianum est dicere, Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum fuisse aut sanguinem fudisse. The bull issued against them is found in the Lps. stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, p. 278–280. Hist. de propositions de Jansen (par *Hilaire Dumas*), Liége, 1699; Trévoux, 1702, 3 vols., 12mo.

Hosted by Google

others, as *Bossuet* very justly remarks, contained the *vital principles* of Jansenism, were condemned by Pope Innocent X. in the bull *Cum occasione*, dated May 31, 1653. This bull was acceptable to nearly all France, the Sorbonne giving the first example of submission, and even the defenders of the propositions yielding to the judgment of the Holy See, from motives of *ecclesiastical obedience*. Of the latter, however, some held that while the condemned propositions were in themselves heretical, they were not in fact contained in the book *Augustinus*, and hence could not be attributed to its author. This distinction between *right* and *fact* again revived the controversy, which, as we shall have occasion to show in the following epoch, grew more heated and acrimonious as time went on.

During the present epoch, a statement of a Franciscan, named *Francis de Santiago*, to the effect that the teaching of the Franciscan Order, relating to the *Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin*, had been positively confirmed by a vision granted to himself, occasioned the revival of the old controversy on this point between the Dominicans and Franciscans. So determined was the attitude of the Dominicans that *Philip III.*, King of Spain, felt it to be his duty to request a solution of the question from the Holy See. The reigning Pope, *Paul V.*, did no more, however, than republish the decrees of Sixtus IV., issued in the years 1476 and 1483, granting a proper "office" for the *Feast* of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and indulgences to those reciting the Divine Office or celebrating or assisting at Mass within the "Octave." He likewise commanded both parties to abstain from branding each other as heretics. While permitting the question to be discussed from a purely scientific point of view, Paul V. forbade it to be made the subject of controversial sermons, and his bull of 1621 ordained that no expression other than "*The Conception of the Blessed Virgin*"[1] should be used in either the missal or the public offices of the Church.

[1] In the editiones Concil. Trident., by *Gallemart* and *Richter*, these bulls are appended to Sess. V., "de peccato originali." Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaedia, Vol. VI., p. 865–872; Fr. tr., Vol. 25, p. 270 sq.

Hosted by Google

A second effort was made by both the contending Orders to obtain through Philip IV. a decision of the question from *Gregory XV.*, which the latter refused to give. *Alexander VII.*, when pressed for a similar decision, published a bull in 1661, in which, while referring to the decisions of his predecessors, he showed an unmistakable tendency to the doctrine of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin *without original sin.*[1]

In 1708 *Clement XI.* made the Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin one of obligation; and the learned Pope Benedict XIV. (1740–1758), summing up the arguments and decisions bearing upon the question, closed his treatise with these words: "While the Apostolic See does not as yet declare the Immaculate Conception of Mary to be an article of faith, it is nevertheless evident that the result of the discussion goes to show that the Church is favorable to the opinion."

§ 352. *Art still in the Service of the Church.* (Cf. § 293.)

† *Glareanus*, Dodecachordon, Basil. 1547. † *Gerbert*, De cantu et musica sacra a prima eccl. aetate usque ad praesens tempus, S. Blas. 1774, 2 T., 4to. *Rio*, L'art chretien, nouv. édit., Par. 1866, 4 T. *Rochlitz*, Outlines of a History of Plain Chant, Lps. 1832. *Kiesewetter*, Hist. of Music in Western Europe, Lps. 1847, 4to. For further bibliography, see § 293.

The strong hold which the faith of the Catholic Church and the splendor of her ceremonial still retained upon men's minds was strikingly illustrated in the efforts made by artists to give expression, though after a new fashion, to the thoughts they inspired. The revival during the fifteenth century of classic taste and the slavish imitation of the models of Greece and Rome, chiefly in the imitative arts, had largely contributed to estrange men's minds from the spirit of the Church. The new *style of church architecture* in Italy was the first expression of this vitiated taste. Even as early as the time of *Julius II.* there was a departure from traditionary *ecclesiastical*

[1] "Sane vetus est Christi fidelium erga ejus beatissimam Matrem Virginem Mariam pietas sentientium, *ejus animam in primo instanti creationis atque infusionis in corpus fuisse speciali Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum J. Chr. ejus Filii humani generis Redemptoris, a macula peccati originalis praeservatam immunem*, atque in hoc sensu ejus Conceptionis festivitatem solemni ritu colentium et celebrantium."

Hosted by Google

architecture in the construction of *St. Peter's* in Rome, after the designs of *Bramante*, which were based upon the classic Greek and Roman styles.[1] These designs were in the main carried out in its continuation and completion by *Raphael* and *Michael Angelo;* but the noble simplicity of the majestic structure, the grandest temple of the Christian world, was marred by the meaningless and incongruous *façade* of *Carlo Maderno*, which sensibly detracts from its splendid proportions and imposing effect. In spite, however, of it defects, St. Peter's was frequently taken as a model, and by degrees came to be accepted as the type of the so-called *Renaissance* style, a taste for which spread rapidly through France and Spain, the various countries of Germany, particularly Bohemia, and through Belgium and England. Its debasement kept pace with its progress through these countries, and its *characteristics* were a tendency to depart from traditional ecclesiastical architecture and a slavish imitation of Greek and Roman details, which, having neither unity nor connection with the main design, gradually lost their signification, and degenerated into absurd contrivances for decoration. In France, this style, which was there known as that of Henry IV., and combined all the defects of the Classic and Gothic, without the merits of either, flourished mostly under Louis XIV. and his great-grandson. So destitute was it of all the principles of art, so offensive to good taste, and so absurdly fantastic in its decoration that, for want of a better word, it was expressively designated "*Rococo.*"

The introduction of the Renaissance in its most debased form into ecclesiastical architecture was prevented by what is known as the "*Jesuit style.*" Hence the churches of this period, though conforming to the general principles of Renaissance construction and exhibiting its uniform sameness of design, still preserve a certain stateliness and correctness of taste.

In *painting*, as in architecture, the learned efforts of the artists of that age to imitate *ancient* models were seriously detrimental to the dignified simplicity and religious inspira-

[1] See Vol. II., p. 1041.

Hosted by Google

tion of the earlier schools, though these qualities are not wanting in the works of *Correggio*, *Titian*, the three noble *Caracci*, *Domenichino*, *Guido Reni*, *Dolce*, *Caravaggio*, and *Salvator Rosa*, in Italy; of *Alonso Berruguate* († 1561), *Perez de Morales* († 1586), *Velasquez*, *Murillo*, and *Alonso Cano* († 1677), in Spain; of *Nicholas Poussin* († 1665), *le Brun* († 1690), *le Sueur*, and others, in France; of *Rembrandt* († 1674), *Rubens* († 1640), and *Van Dyke*, in the Netherlands; and of *Albert Dürer* († 1528), *Holbein* († 1554), *Christopher Schwarz*, *Joaquin Sandrart*, and others, in Germany.

Poetry, like the other arts, was still in the service of the Church. Breaking through the pedantic mannerism of the age, the muse of *Torquato Tasso* († 1595) took a nobler flight, and consecrated in heroic verse the chivalrous and religious exploits of the Middle Ages in his great poem, "*Jerusalem Delivered*" (*Gerusalemme Liberata*).[1] *Calderon de la Barca* († 1681), who, after having borne arms as a gallant soldier, became a priest and canon of Toledo, sang in sweet and graceful numbers of the heroism of Christians and the unfading crown of glory they shall receive on waking from "*the dream of this life.*" Much of his fertile dramatic genius and glowing religious enthusiasm was expended in illustrating in his "*Autos Sacramentales*" or "*Corpus Christi*" pieces the mysteries of the Christian religion. These dramatic productions, intended to be played in the open air on Corpus Christi Day and other feasts of the Church, were allegorical in character, being based on Scriptural events, but combining in their composition references to incidents related in the history of the people or consecrated in their folklore.[2]

Lope de Vega was a still more striking example of the same spirit and tendency. He led a roving life in his youth, and having, like Calderon, borne arms with distinction, he con-

[1] Transl. into German by *Streckfuss*, 2d ed., Lps. 1835, 2 vols. The most complete edition of his work appeared at Pisa, 1821–1832, in 33 vols.

[2] *Calderon's* (95) Autos Sacramentales or Corpus Christi pieces, in a German translation, with introductory remarks by *Lorinser*, Ratisbon, 1856–1872, 18 vols. Goethe and Schlegel have made Calderon popular in Germany. In Britain he is not well known, and in France not appreciated. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

tinued, even amid the distractions of military life, to pour forth poems with amazing rapidity. His imagination, though fertile and even exuberant, was correct, and his powers of production inexhaustible. It is said that, besides his other multitudinous performances, he was the author of one thousand eight hundred dramas. Nor was his genius wholly devoted to secular themes; his pen embellished the gravest subjects, and gave poetic expression to the most sublime ideas of religion. After the death of his second wife, he entered the Order of St. Francis, and in 1609 was ordained a priest. Toward the close of his days he felt happy only in the solitude of the cloister, and so terrific were his self-scourgings that the walls of his cell were frequently spattered with his blood, and the illness of which he died (1635) was occasioned by one of these bodily castigations.[1] Mention should also be made of *James Balde*, *Frederic von Spee*,[2] and *Angelus Silesius* (*John Scheffler*).[3] The last named was born at Breslau in 1624, of Protestant parents, practised medicine in his early manhood, was converted to the Catholic Church when twenty-nine years of age, and afterward studied theology and took priest's orders. He published a number of writings in defense of his new faith, and having lived an exemplary life as a religious man, died a holy death, July 9, 1677, in a convent of his native city. Of his religious poems, the collection most prized, alike by his contemporaries and by posterity, is that entitled "*Yearnings of the Soul*" (*Heilige Seelenlust*). These pieces were set to music by *George Josephi*, musician in ordinary

[1] A full account of Lope de Vega's life and writings will be found in *Ticknor's* History of Spanish Literature, N. Y. 1869. There is also a good essay on him in *Prescott's* Biographical Miscellanies, Boston, 1857. (Tr.)

[2] *Balde*, New ed. of his Carmina lyrica and Batrachomyomachia, Münster, 1856-59. *Spee*, Mock Nightingale (*Trutznachtigall*), published by Brentano, Berlin, 1817; also by Junckman and Hueppe, with melodies and an introduction, Coesfeld, 1841. Virtue's Golden Book (Güldenes Tugendbuch), Coblenz, 1829. *Smets*, Pious Hymns, by Spee, Bonn, 1849. Conf. *W. Lindemann*, Hist. of German Literature, Freiburg, 1866, p. 389 sq.

[3] *John Scheffler*, Complete Works, published by *Dr. Rosenthal*, Ratisbon, 1862. 2 vols. † *Wittmann*, Angelius Silesius as a Convert, Mystic Poet, and Controversialist, Augsburg, 1842.

Hosted by Google

to the Bishop of Breslau, and published with his melodies in 1657.[1]

Music[2] continued in alliance with painting, sculpture, and poetry during this epoch, contributing like these to spiritualize and elevate the ceremonial of public worship. The Flemings were, during the fourteenth century, the great masters of church-music, and it was among them that the *modern* music first assumed the character of an art, capable of giving utterance to the high aspirations of the soul and the tender emotions of the heart. At first serious, expressive, and ennobling, it gradually degenerated into a dry, artificial, and learned style of music, owing chiefly to the fact that the Church being unwilling to give up her time-honored melodies, its advocates were forced to confine their talents to the harmonies, and as a consequence not unfrequently introduced into their compositions secular and profane airs, wholly inappropriate to the object for which they were intended.[3] Religious music had so far declined as to give occasion to serious complaints at the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII. and XXIV.), some of the Fathers even advocating its entire banishment from the service of the Church.[4] It was, however, saved by *Palestrina*, whose *genius* restored it to its true dignity. *Giovanni Pierluigi* or *Palestrina*, a surname derived from the name of his birthplace, was born of poor parents in the year 1524. Even while still very young, his musical talents attracted the attention of a musician, by whom he was admitted into the cathedral choir of his native town. He there gave promise of future greatness, and at the age of sixteen went to Rome, where he studied music under Claude Goudimel. At the age of twenty-seven he was appointed director of music in the *Julian Chapel*, in St. Peter's, lately completed by Pope Julius

[1] Heilige Seelenlust, being Spiritual Hymns, by *Angelus Silesius*, revised and published as a book of devotion, by W. Winterer and Sprenger, Mannheim, 1838; Stuttg. 1846.

[2] Cf. *Nicholas Wiseman's* Lectures on Holy Week, delivered in Rome, 1837. (German tr., by *Axinger*, Augsb. 1840.

[3] *Mansi*, Vol. XXIX., p. 107. (Tr.)

[4] Church Music and the Council of Trent (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 42).

Hosted by Google

III. It is said that Pope Marcellus II. suggested to the gifted young artist the idea of religious music, to which he gave such exquisite expression in the *Missa Marcelli*, published in 1555, during the pontificate of Paul IV. His famous *Improperia*, published in 1560, are not less sublime. These are sorrowful and tender reproaches, addressed, in the language of the Prophet Micheas (VI. 3 sq.), by Our Divine Savior to an ungrateful and heartless people, and are sung on Good Friday in Greek and Latin, together with the so-called *Trisagion*: "*Holy God, Omnipotent God, Immortal God.*" Dr. Burney calls Palestrina the Homer of religious music, and had he no claim other than the *Improperia* give him to the title, they would be amply sufficient to merit it. That he persuaded the College of Cardinals, assembled for the definite purpose of banishing modern music forever from the service of the Church, to allow the compositions, which he submitted to them for examination, to be performed during divine service (1564), was not the least of his triumphs. Combining the stateliness of the Gregorian chant with the vivacity of modern melody, the compositions of Palestrina are also remarkable for the richness, the gravity, and the solemnity of their harmonies. Like all church music deserving the name, they are admirably adapted for choral singing.[1]

In the year 1533, *Luigi Dentice* composed a *Miserere*, which enjoyed a high reputation, until it was surpassed by the famous composition of *Allegri* upon the same subject. Called from Fermo to Rome by Urban VIII., he was appointed a member of the choir in the Sistine Chapel, a position which he held until his death in 1652. His most celebrated composition is his *Miserere*, still annually performed in the same chapel. It was originally written for two choirs, the one of five and the other of four voices, which sing alternate verses until the *Gloria Patri* is reached, when the nine unite and sing together till the close. The music of this famous composition expresses with wonderful power and sympathetic precision the calm, deep, and thoughtful sorrow that weighs upon the soul of the earnest Christian, seriously meditating

[1] *Baini*, Memorie della vita di G. P. da Palestrina, Roma, 1828, 2 vols., 4to.

Hosted by Google

on the passion of Our Lord, and the tumultuous yet subdued feelings that agitate his whole being, when contemplating the last scene of the tragedy on the heights of Calvary.

The movement was forwarded in Spain by *Morales*, and in Belgium by *Orlando di Lasso* or Lassus, both of whom were mainly instrumental, each in his own country, in preserving the grave and religious character of church music, now seriously threatened by the operatic style lately introduced at Florence (about 1600) by some members of the Medicean Academy. With a view of directly counteracting the worldly spirit of the lyric drama, a new school of music, of which *St. Philip Neri* is regarded as the founder, was started in the Oratory at Rome. The compositions, taken as a whole, were called *Biblical Dramas* or *Oratorios*, from the place in which they were performed. The text, of which the subject was usually some Scriptural incident or character, was, as a rule, partly epic and partly dramatic; and the music consisted of recitatives, airs, duets, trios, quartets, and choruses, with an orchestral or organ accompaniment. This sort of lyrico-religious drama was performed mostly during the Lenten season, and was singularly solemn and attractive.[1]

§ 353. *Religious Life.*

The fervent wishes for a true reformation in the Church, to which expression was so frequently given by the Fathers assembled in Councils during the course of the fifteenth century, and by other saintly and earnest men, were in a large measure realized during the period of which we are treating. But while, on the one hand, we congratulate ourselves on results so consolatory, on the other we should remember and frankly admit that they would not have been either so thoroughly or so speedily carried out had they not received an impulse from the unexpected and violent assaults of the pretended Reformers. If an age may be judged by the number of illustrious men, pious Popes, zealous bishops, sainted founders of Religious Orders, and learned doctors, which it

[1] Conf. *Fink*, Hist. of Musical Oratorios (Periodical of Hist. Theology, 1842, nro. 3).

Hosted by Google

produces, none in the whole history of the Church is more glorious than this. Among the more remarkable and better known are *St. Francis de Sales*, *St. Vincent de Paul*, *St. John of the Cross*, *St. Thomas of Villanova*,[1] *Bartholomew a Martyribus* († July 16, 1590),[2] *St. Ignatius*, *St. Francis Xavier*, *St. Aloysius Gonzaga*, *St. Stanislaus Kostka*,[3] *St. Philip Neri*, *Blessed Lawrence of Brindisi*,[4] *St. John of God*, *St. Teresa*, *St. Joan Frances de Chantal*, *St. Angela* (Merici) *of Brescia*, and many more, nearly, if not quite so distinguished for saintliness of character and purity of life, all forming a catalogue of glorious names, to the least of which the Protestant Church did not produce a single one to compare. No faithful Catholic can pass in review so many patterns of heroic virtue and Christian perfection, or dwell even momentarily upon the life of so exalted a character as *St. Charles Borromeo*,[5] without feeling his faith strengthened and his courage animated.

Born October 2, 1538, of an illustrious family, at the Castle of Arona, the ancestral home of the house of Borromeo, Charles, even in infancy, gave such tokens of tender piety and religious zeal that a priest of Milan, forecasting his future, said of him: "This child will one day be a reformer of

[1] †*Maimbourg*, La vie de St. Thom. de Villeneuve, Paris, 1666. Life of Thomas a Villanova, by *F. W. Faber*, London, 1847. Latin Life by *Feigerle*, Aulic Chaplain, and subsequently Bp. of St. Hippolyt. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Sion*, year 1841, Jn. nros. 10–13. His principal work, for the use of bishops, "Stimulus Pastorum," ed. first, 1572, at Rome; latterly by Bp. *Fessler*, at Rome, Paris, Madrid, and Brussels (Einsideln, New York, and Cincinnati), 1863. (Tr.)

[3] *Daurignac*, Hist. of St. Aloysius, trans. into German, by *Clarus*, Frkf. 1866. The Life of St. Stanislas Kostka, S. J., by *E. H. Thompson*, Philadelphia, 1870. (Tr.)

[4] Father *Schulenburg*, Life of Bl. Lawrence of Brindisi, Mentz, 1863.

[5] Opp. Carol. Borrom., Milan, 1747, 5 T., fol. Homiliae et alia praefat. et annot. J. A. Saxii., Aug. Vind. 1758, 2 T. fol. Acta Mediolanensia; Noctes Vaticanae; Sermones habiti in academia, Romae in palatio vaticano instituta; Pastorum instructiones et epp., ed. *Westhoff*, Monast. 1846. An excellent Italian biography, by *J. P. Giussano*; trans. into French, by *Cloysault*, Avignon, 1824, 2 vols.; into German, by *Klitsche*, Augsburg, 1836, 3 vols. Vie de St. Charles Borromée, by *A. Godeau*, Paris, 1747. English Life, by *Edw. Healy Thompson*, London, 1858; *Touron*, La vie et l'esprit de St. Charles Borromée, Paris, 1751.

Hosted by Google

the Church, and accomplish great things." He studied laws at the University of Pavia, where he received the degree of doctor in 1559. His heart was so saddened and afflicted by the laxity and dissoluteness of the Benedictine monks of Arona, that, on the death of his father, he made up his mind to give himself wholly to the service of the Church. So remarkable was his virtue, and so great his capacity for business, that his uncle, Pope Pius IV., called him to Rome, and, despite his youth, apppointed him to many important offices, and, at the age of twenty-two, created him cardinal and Archbishop of Milan (1560). While presiding as Legate over the government of Ancona, Bologna, and other cities within the States of the Church, he displayed unusual executive talents, and was equally distinguished for the ability with which he discharged the duties and offices connected with the government of the Church which were committed to him at Rome. Surrounded by luxury and magnificence, his deportment was grave, his life saintly, and his manners austere. Studious himself, he fostered a love of letters in others, and, after the exhausting labors of the day, was wont to spend his evenings discussing scientific and ethical questions with a number of scholars, clerical and lay, whom he gathered about him in the Vatican, and to whom he was a munificent patron. He was appointed Grand Penitentiary by Pius IV., who never undertook any affair of moment without having first consulted with his nephew. Having placed himself under the spiritual direction of *John Ribeira*, a saintly Jesuit, the wealth and beauty of his predestined soul became daily more conspicuous and his life more holy. His indefatigable activity, much of which was exerted in holding provincial *councils* and diocesan *synods;* his influence at the Court of Rome and with the delegates attending the Council of Trent; and his zeal in restoring discipline in Religious Orders and in remodeling *ecclesiastical seminaries*, place him beyond all question at the very head of the reformers of the Church during this epoch.

So deep and tender was his charity toward others, and so great his own spirit of self-denial, that, to give play to the exercise of both, he founded those numerous eleemosynary

Hosted by Google

institutions which history has connected with his name. Severe toward himself, he was rigorous with the clergy of his diocese, teaching them both by precept and example to fully appreciate the dignity and excellence of their calling, and to realize in their lives the high standard of conduct which it demands. As for himself, his whole life was one continuous exemplification of the exalted virtues so befitting the priestly character. In his own person he exhibited to the world the rare example of one who, having commenced life amid the splendor of the purple and the highest ecclesiastical dignities, closed his days literally worn out with the exhausting and important labors of a self-sacrificing *pastor*, mourned by his people as by loving children who had lost the tenderest and most prudent of fathers (November 3, 1584).[1] A grateful posterity erected to the memory of the great archbishop a colossal bronze statue on the shore of Lago Maggiore, which seems even still to protect by its presence the land of his birth and the scenes of his youth.

The lives and examples of these saints and illustrious men exerted a powerful influence upon the masses of the people, whose progress in holy-living was fostered and promoted by the various Religious Orders, whose members specially devoted themselves to the instruction of the laity, the education of children, the care of the poor, and the service of the sick. Of those who gave themselves with the most disinterested zeal to the training and instruction of youth, stimulated by no motive other than the purest charity, the Jesuits, the Piarists, and the Ursulines, not to mention others equally deserving, were conspicuous. The foolish and inhuman practice of trying persons upon charges of *witchcraft*[2] was successfully assailed by many writers of name, such as *Herman Loeher*;[3] *Dr. Andrew Schweygel*, of Rheinbach, near Boun; *John Freylink*, a Dominican, of Cologne; *Stapirius*, pastor of Hirschberg, in Westphalia; *Cornelius Loos*, of Mentz († 1593); the

[1] *Sailer*, St. Charles Borromeo, Augsburg, 1824. *Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo and the Reformation of the Church in his Age, Cologne, 1846.

[2] Cf. § 283.

[3] *Loeher*, when an octogenarian, still wrote: Urgent, Humble, and Woeful Complaint of Pious and Innocent People, etc., Amsterdam, 1676.

Hosted by Google

Jesuit, *Tanner* († 1632); and most effectively by Father *Frederic Spee.*[1]

In conclusion, it may be remarked that never in any age of the Church did the clergy labor more earnestly for the spread of religion and the cultivation of morals among the people than at the time when the Protestants cut themselves off from communion with the See of Rome, to which they were indebted for whatever of truth and religious conviction they still retained.

[1] (*Fred. Spee*), Cautio criminalis seu de processibus contra Sagas liber ad magistratus Germ. hoc tempore necessarius, etc. (auctore theologo Romano), Rinthel. 1631, and frequently. Cf. *Jungmann*, Catholic Voices against Trials for Witchcraft, Raised at a Time when They Were Most in Vogue (*Cath. Magazine*, Vols. III. and IV., Münster, 1847–1848.)

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER V.

RELATION OF CATHOLICS TO PROTESTANTS.

§ 354. *Attempts at Reconciliation.*

Hering, History of the Efforts at Reconciliation, made since the Reformation, Lps. 1836–38, 2 vols. *Neudecker*, The Principal Attempts at the Pacification of the Evangelical and Protestant Churches of Germany, Lps. 1846. Cf. *Gieseler*, Manual of Ch. H., Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 449 sq.

It is difficult to conceive how, possessing a knowledge of the events already related—the fierce conflicts, heated controversies, universal disorders, and the fruitless attempts, made both before and after the Council of Trent, to effect a reconciliation—persons, both Catholic and Protestant, should be found who still cherished the hope of bringing about a union between the Catholic Church and the Lutheran and Reformed sects. The very character of Protestantism, inasmuch as it affords no common ground upon which its advocates and opponents might base a compromise of this character, should have taught these well-meaning men that every such attempt was necessarily futile. When *Julius von Pflug*, as presiding officer of the Conference of Worms (1557), requested the Lutheran orators to confine the discussion to the *Augsburg Confession*, giving as a reason that it would be impossible for the Catholic theologians to follow them through all mazes of varying and shadowy systems, seven of the twelve present refused to accede to his request, thus putting an end to the deliberations. But the perils arising out of these religious dissensions, and menacing both the social and political fabric, overruled the teachings of experience; and many good and wise men put forth their energies in the vain hope of reconciling and uniting the hostile parties. Of these, *Ferdinand I.* of Austria was particularly active.

George Cassander, (†1566), pursuing a line of thought analogous to that drawn out by *Erasmus* in his "*De amicabili Ec-*

Hosted by Google

clesiae concordia," published a work entitled "*Judicium de officio pii ac publicae tranquillitatis vere amantis viri in hoc religionis dissidio,*" in which he insists that to labor for union is the sacred duty of all Christians.[1] The movement was vehemently and energetically opposed by Calvin. Nevertheless, Ferdinand requested Cassander to draw out and publish his views on the subject (1564). This work, which made its appearance only after the death of the emperor, was entitled "*De articulis relig. inter Cathol. et Protestant. controversis ad imperatores Ferdin. I. et Maxim. II. consultatio.*" His views are as moderate as could be looked for under the circumstances, but the interpretations which he put upon Scripture and tradition, with a view to show that the Papacy is not of divine institution, are arbitrary in the extreme. His statements, while they seemed very like paradoxes to Catholics, found no favor with Protestants. *George Wizel,*[2] who, having gone over to Protestantism, again returned to the Church, had already published, with a similar purpose, a work entitled "*Regia via seu de controversis religionis capitibus concilliandis sententia,*" basing his argument on the twenty-one articles of the Augsburg Confession. These attempts, as also those of *Frederic Staphylus*, of Osnabrück, one of Luther's disciples, and formerly professor at Koenigsberg; and of the Jesuit, *Adam Contzen*, of Cologne, in his "*Discursuum theologico-politicorum libri XIII.,*" and "*De pace Germaniae,*" utterly failed of the purpose for which they were intended.

Two religious conferences, the one at *Baden* in 1589, and the other at *Emmendingen* in 1590, both of them set on foot by *James*, Margrave of Baden, a recent convert to the Catholic Church, and having the same object in view, failed as utterly in establishing harmony as any of the efforts that had preceded them.[3] But so hopeful were the Catholics of bringing

[1] Cf. *Meuser*, On Cassander, in Dieringer's Cath. Journal, year II., Vol. 3.

[2] Beside the work quoted above, Cologne, about 1564, ed. *Conring*, Helmst. 1650, 4to, we have to notice still: *Typus Eccl. Cathol.*, or Forms and Signs, which have guided and governed the Holy, Apostolic, and Catholic Church for a thousand years throughout Christendom; in five parts, Cologne, 1540, 4to. See *Döllinger*, Vol. I., p. 18 sq.

[3] What *Vierordt*, in his Hist. of the Evangelical Reformation in the Grand-

Hosted by Google

about a reconciliation that the aggressive and offensive conduct of the Protestants, on the occasion of the *centenary celebration of the Reformation*,[1] in 1617, could not shake their courage or deter them from again repeating what had so often been proved to be little better than acts of charitable folly. Those who were now foremost in the movement were the Jesuits, *John Dez*, *Scheffmacher*, and *James Masenius*.[2]

In *France* attempts were likewise made by Cardinal Richelieu to unite religious parties, but more with a view to further his own policy than from disinterested motives. At his request, the Jesuit, *Audebert*, met *Amyraut*, the celebrated Reformed theologian, in conference, and made important concessions; but, fortunately, a compromise, which might have been the source of very alarming dangers, was prevented by the insuperable difficulties presented when the question of transubstantiation came up for discussion. *Francis Veron*, also a Jesuit, acting on a similar request, proposed a plan of union (*Methodus nova, facilis et solida haereses ex fundamento destruendi*, 1619), the drift of which was that the Protestants should be required to demonstrate their principles and assertions from distinct passages of Holy Writ. He wrote another treatise, directed equally against *the extreme schools of Catholic opinion* and the false interpretations of Protestants.[3] Another work, "The Analysis of Faith" (*Analysis fidei*), by *Henry Holden* († c. 1665), was written for a similar aim, but failed of its purpose. The irenical work of *Bossuet* had a measure of success in certain localities.[4] Efforts equally earnest and

Duchy of Baden (Carlsruhe, 1847, 2 vols.) but slightly touched upon, is fully detailed, in three articles of the Hist. and Polit. Papers, 1856, On the Conversion of the Margrave and the Two Conferences. Cf. *Raess*, Converts, Vol. III., p. 91 sq., and Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. IV., p. 89–122.

[1] *Werner*, Hist. of Apolog. and Polemical Literature, Vol. IV., p. 589 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 750 sq.

[3] *Francisci Veronii* Regula Fidei s. secretio eorum, quae sunt de fide cathol. ab iis, quae non sunt de fide, Par. 1644, and often; Aquisgrani, 1842, 12mo; by *Smets*, in Latin and German, Elberfeld, 1843. Of a kindred spirit are the subsequent treatises by *Chrismann*, Regula fidei cath. et collectio dogmatum credendorum, denuo ed. *Spindler*, Wirceburgi, 1855, and by *Bossuet*, Exposition de la doctrine catholique, in many editions and translations. Collected in *Braun*, Bibliotheca regularum fidei, Bonnae, 1844, etc., 2 T.

[4] See above, p. 283.

Hosted by Google

equally fruitless were made by King *Ladislaus* IV. to secure religious union in *Poland.* Foreseeing the dangers that threatened his country, he was encouraged to prosecute his benevolent designs by the return to the Church of eminent scholars like *Berthold Nihus* and *Christopher Besold;* of distinguished preachers like *Bartholomew Nigrinus;* and by the publication, at Helmstaedt, of the writings of the celebrated *Hugo Grotius* and *George Calixtus,* in which they had expressed their doubts both as to the necessity of the schism and the wisdom of perpetuating it. Accordingly he opened a correspondence with the representatives of both parties, with a view to have them hold a religious conference at *Thorn.*[1] They also received an invitation of the same purport from *Lubienski,* Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, who, in a letter dated November 12, 1643, wrote as follows:

"It would seem that there are many points of contact and agreement on both sides. If each party will hold on to what is certain, clear up what is obscure, and verify what is plainly open to discussion, by the testimony of the Scriptures and the teaching of the primitive Church, there will be no difficulty in finding out what is the Catholic truth; and having ascertained it, and brushed away whatever may have heretofore dimmed its luster, all will be convinced that there was no adequate cause for the schism in the first instance, and no reason for perpetuating it now."

Ladislaus, learning that the dissidents took offense at language even so calm and temperate as this, sought to conciliate them by an appeal to their patriotism, their national traditions, and religious feelings. In an invitation addressed to them, bearing the date of March 20, 1644, he said:

"One who can remain insensible in the presence of so protracted, so cruel, and so relentless a war, without putting to himself the questions, What has kindled such fierce hatred? Why so much blood shed? Why so great resources exhausted? must indeed be destitute of every noble feeling. Europe, shaken to her very center, totters and reels under the accumulated weight of her misfortunes and her crimes. *Religious discord* alone has kindled among Christians a hatred so fierce that human prudence seems powerless to extinguish it.

[1] Scripta facientia ad colloquium a Seren. et pot. Pol. rege Vladislav. IV. Toruni in Borussia ad. d. X. Octob. 1644, indictum, accessit *Georgii Calixti* consideratio et epicrisis, Helmstad. 1645. Cf. *A. Menzel,* l. c., Vol. VIII., p. 102–128.

Hosted by Google

What the God of peace gave as a bond of union, the father of lies and the fomentor of discord has converted into a source of hatred, injustice, and distrust among men. It is our wish, therefore, to restore union to the body of Christ, rent by human opinion, and to re-establish religious peace, so long disturbed. While, on the one hand, the Church, like a solicitous mother, has left no means untried to secure this end; on the other, the untiring energy of the Polish intellect, and, still more, the spirit of Christian charity, have inspired me with the hope that, in the infinite mercy of God, what has been destroyed by the malice of the enemy may be restored, and what has been corrupted made whole. Are we not all children of the same Father? Have we not the same origin, the same baptism, the same name? Has not the same Church, washed in the Blood of Christ, given birth to us all? Are we not governed by the same laws that our fathers obeyed for centuries? Those whom brotherly love should bind together in union and harmony are divided and separated by prejudices of education and the artifices of the enemy of mankind. Hence we should put forth our best efforts to find a remedy for these evils, which we all deplore, and which sadden the heart of our Supreme Pastor. Heretofore learned writings have been published and special conferences held, but to no purpose; however, we may still be permitted to hope that opinions will be reconciled and peace restored by amicable discussion. The Church, like a tender and loving mother, appeals to you as to well-beloved children. Her age, her misfortunes, her wounds command your respect. She is more vigorous than the centuries; they have left the traces of age upon her, but she is still robust. Evil she overcomes by charity, and by patience heals her wounds. . . . There is one sorrow no art can soften—the pangs she suffers in having her children torn from her bosom by heresy and schism. She pines away in the expectant hope of seeing them again return from their wanderings. She observes the winds, rushes to the beach, stretches out her arms to the shipwrecked, calls out to them, beseeching them to come and take possession of the heritage of peace that has been lost to them for a century. Such also is our wish, such the tender prayer we extend to our separated brethren."

The desired meeting took place in October, 1645, at Thorn. The Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg sent their theologians, and, with the gracious consent of the Duke of Brunswick, *George Calixtus* was also present. But though a moderate and temperate man, Calixtus was not acceptable to Catholics, and because he was in favor of establishing amicable relations with the Reformed Church, extreme Lutherans, like *Calovius* and *Hülsemann*, shunned him as they might a plague. "To my amazement," wrote Calovius, "I have seen him seated in the midst of false Calvinistic prophets, whom he regards as his brothers in Christ." The temper of mind, which these words indicate, was not favorable to reconciliation. The Catholic cause was ably sustained by the Jesuit,

Hosted by Google

Father *Schoenhofer*, who showed very satisfactorily that the charges brought against the Catholic Church by Protestants had no foundation, in either her principles or dogmas, as truly set forth in authorized works, such as the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* and the *Roman Catechism.* This, like all other religious conferences intended to reconcile irreconcilable parties, had no effect other than to still further alienate Lutherans and Catholics, and to excite against George Calixtus the indignation of the extremists of his own sect.

§ 355. *The Thirty Years' War.*

Khevenhüller († 1650), Annales Ferdinandei, fr. 1578 to 1637, Viennae, 1646, 9 T., fol.; ed. II., Lps. 1721–1726, 12 T., fol. *Theatrum Europaeum*, or Relation of all Memorable Events, fr. 1618–1718, Frankfort, 1643–1738, 21 pts. *Hurter*, Hist. of Ferdinand II. and his Parents, Schaffh. 1850 sq. *Caroli Caraffa*, Commenta de Germania sacra restaurata, Colon. 1639, along with about 200 Decreta diplomatica, etc. *Ginzel*, Legatio Apostolica Petri Aloysii Caraffae (1624–1634), Wirceburgi, 1839. *Barthold*, Hist. of the Great German War, from the death of Gustavus Adolphus, with a special reference to France, Stuttg. 1842 sq., 2 vols. *K. A. Menzel* (New Hist. of Germany, Vol. VI.–VIII). *Mailath*, Hist. of the Austrian Empire, Vol. III. *Onno Klopp*, Tilly in the Thirty Years' War, Stuttg. 1861 sq., 2 vols. *Gfroerer*, Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, and his Age, 4th ed., by Onno Klopp, Stuttg. 1863. *Koch*, Ferdinand III., Vienna, 1865. *Maurice Ritter*, Letters and Acts supplementary toward the Hist. of the Thirty Years' War, etc., Munich, 1870, Vol. I. Cf. *Janssen*, Latest Researches on the Thirty Years' War (Tuebg. Quarterly, 1861, p. 532–568).

The expressions employed by Protestants in the various Religious Conferences, when speaking of the Church, roused the passions and spoiled the temper of Catholics. To be constantly represented in Protestant controversial sermons and polemical writings as a superstitious, bigoted, and idolatrous class, and that, too, by those who knew better, increased their indignation. The ecclesiastical reservation article (*reservatum ecclesiasticum*) in the Peace of Augsburg (1555), inasmuch as it was constantly being violated, became a source of ceaseless trouble. In Northern Germany, where the violations of the Peace were of more frequent occurrence, the estates belonging to the sees of *Havelberg*, *Brandenburg*, *Naumburg*, *Meissen*, *Schwerin*, *Lebus*, *Camin*, *Magdeburg*, *Halberstadt*, *Minden*, *Verden*, *Bremen*, *Lübeck*, *Osnabrück*, and *Ratzeburg* were seized by

Hosted by Google

the Protestants as occasion offered. For a time the Catholics offered no resistance, but when the elector, *Gebhard*, High Steward of Cologne (from 1577), after having long kept up criminal relations with Agnes, Countess of Mansfeld and Canoness of Gerresheim, finally passed over to the Reformed Church, and attempted to involve his whole diocese in his apostasy, they made a determined stand for their rights. In 1583 Gebhard was deposed by the Holy See, and *Ernest*, Bishop of Liége, and a *Bavarian prince*, who had been appointed by the Chapter of Cologne, forcibly installed in his room. This proceeding, though sanctioned by the Peace of Augsburg, was loudly denounced by Protestants as iniquitous. While carrying out wherever they could the principle "*Cujus regio, illius religio*," they vehemently protested against the conduct of *Julius*, Bishop of Wurzburg (after 1555), and *Philip of Baden-Baden* (after 1571), who were only exerting themselves to bring their people back again to the Church. The abjuration of the Margrave of *Baden* and *Hochberg* was the signal for another shout of intolerant protest;[1] and the chorus, now pitched in a higher key, was swelled by the indignant voices of those who, witnessing the splendid triumphs achieved for the Church by the Society of Jesus, put forth every resource at their command to weaken, if not destroy, its efficiency. At *Donauwörth*, where the number of Protestants had largely increased, the Catholic magistracy was deposed; Catholic worship subjected to annoying strictures; and those in the procession of the Blessed Sacrament on Corpus Christi Day of the year 1606 violently assaulted. By decree of the Imperial Chamber and Aulic Council of Vienna, the city was laid under ban of the Empire. The decree was carried into execution by *Maximilian I., Duke of Bavaria*,[2] who seized the city, and,

[1] The Earlier Lists and Biographies of Converts, from the beginning of Protestantism, by †*Hoenighaus*; Chronological List of the most remarkable Conversions from Protestantism to the Catholic Church, down to our own days, Aschaffenburg, 1837, and by *Rohrbacher*, Schaffhausen, 1844. These were followed by the most complete work on the lives of Converts, together with a statement of their apologetical writings, either in full or in substance, written by the Right Rev. Dr. *Raess*, Bishop of Strasburg, and entitled Converts since the Reformation, Freiburg, 1866–1872, 10 vols., and a supplementary volume.

[2] Baron *Aretin*, Hist. of the Elector, Maximilian I., Duke of Bavaria, from

Hosted by Google

because of its inability to defray the expenses of the war, sequestered it. Notwithstanding the steady devotion of the inhabitants of *Aix-la-Chapelle* to the Catholic religion and its interests, the Protestants of that city, having called the Netherlanders to their aid, publicly exercised their worship and elected burgomasters to their own liking.[1] When, in 1581, an Imperial Commission set about restoring the former condition of things, the Protestants revolted, and recourse had to be had to armed force, in order to recover the property and possessions of Catholics. Similar means had to be employed at *Strasburg* to enforce the *reservatum ecclesiasticum* and frustrate an attempt to hand the city over to a Protestant bishop. The feelings of rancor and bitterness, which these collisions necessarily occasioned, were still further intensified by the *policy of France.* With a view to weaken the house of Hapsburg, she was mainly instrumental in effecting the *Union* of the Protestant princes at *Ahausen* (May 4, 1608), of which *Frederic V., of the Palatinate*, became the head. To oppose this coalition, the Catholic princes, in the following year, formed the *League of Würzburg*, at the head of which *Maximilian* of Bavaria, both on account of his interests and by reason of his abilities, was very naturally placed.

The war was imminent, and had it not been for the assassination of *Henry IV.*, the leader of the Union, would have immediately broken out. Only a plausible pretext was wanting, and this was furnished by the course of events in Bohemia. Protestantism had been slowly making its way into the hereditary territories of Austria, during the reign of Ferdinand I., and into Bohemia during that of Maximilian II., mainly through the efforts of the Utraquists, who, in going over to Protestantism, simultaneously revived the fierce fanaticism of the Hussites. The people, rising in revolt, entered into negotiations with foreign potentates, and in their diets

authentic sources, 1 vol., Passau, 1842. Conf., also, on Duke Maximilian I., the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., pp. 279 sq., 422 sq., 513 sq. *Schreiber*, Maximilian, the Catholic Elector, and the Thirty Years' War, Munich, 1868.

[1] *Fr. D. Haeberlein*, Modern Hist. of the German Empire, Vol. XI., p. 353; Vol. XII., p. 319. *A. Menzel*, l. c., Vol. V., p. 141 sq.

Hosted by Google

boldly demanded religious liberty as a condition before contributing anything toward defraying the expenses of the wars against the Turks. Under the circumstances, Maximilian II. thought it prudent to grant to the *Lords* and *Knights* freedom of worship, which, *contrary* to stipulation, was extended to cities and market-towns. Again, the Protestants of Bohemia forced *Rudolph II.*, who gave more of his attention to the absurdities of astrology and alchemy than to the interests of the empire, to issue an imperial rescript,[1] granting freedom of worship to all Lords, Knights, and cities that had embraced Protestantism. Emboldened by these concessions, the Protestants under *Matthias* openly defied the imperial authority. The latter being without issue, Ferdinand II., grandson of *Ferdinand I.*, and heir apparent to the throne, was crowned in 1617. Devoted to the faith and the interests of the Catholic Church, and alarmed by the seditious movements of the Protestants and their intrigues with foreign princes,[2] Ferdinand exerted himself to the utmost of his power to crush out Protestantism in his patrimonial territories of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, thereby drawing on himself the bitter enmity of the sectaries of Austria and Bohemia. By the rescript of Rudolph, Lords, Knights, and royal cities, but not the tenants of Catholic landlords, were authorized to build churches on ground belonging to Catholics. Hence, when the emperor ordered the church at *Klostergrab* to be destroyed, and that at *Braunau* to be closed, the former having been built by the tenants of the Archbishop of Prague, and the latter by those of the Abbot of Braunau, the *Utraquists*, as the Lutherans were now called, professing to regard this as a violation of the Imperial Rescript, made the matter the subject of a formal complaint to the emperor. Infuriated by the menacing tone of the emperor's reply, the memorialists, breaking through all the restraints of law and order, made their way into the royal castle at Prague (May 13, 1618), and,

[1] *Gindely*, Rudolph II. and his Age, 1600–1612. Prague, 1862 sq., 2 vols. (very important in all matters relating to the Thirty Years' War). The *same*, Hist. of the Grant of the Imperial Edict of 1609, Prague, 1858.

[2] The Struggle of Emperor Ferdinand against the Protestant States of Austria (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., pp. 673 sq.; Vol. IV., pp. 168 sq., pp. 219 sq.)

Hosted by Google

seizing the imperial counsellors, *Martinetz* and *Slawata*, its accredited authors, pitched them headlong out through the windows.

The members of the Diet, favorable to the Utraquists, acting upon the direction of *Count Thurn*, placed the supreme authority in the hands of a Regency of thirty directors, raised an army, and, as their first aggressive act, expelled the Jesuits. Assured of the sympathy of the Union, they attacked the cities still loyal to the emperor, penetrated into Austria, and on the death of the Emperor Matthias, discarding Ferdinand II., who had been a student of the Jesuits at Ingolstadt, and would have made any sacrifice to secure the triumph of Catholicity, elected as their king *Frederic V. of the Palatinate.* In the meantime, internal dissensions were dividing the members of the Union. *Hoé*, preacher to the Elector of Saxony, indignantly protested against the outrage of "surrendering the Bohemians a prey to the Calvinistic antichrists;" the aid from England promised by King James I. was not forthcoming; and misfortunes following rapidly upon the heels of each other, culminated in the disaster of White Mountain, where the Bohemians, under the lead of Frederic of the Palatinate, were defeated, November 8, 1620.[1]

War had also broken out in Germany. The cause of Frederic of the Palatinate was championed by the *Margrave of Baden-Durlach;* the *Count of Mansfeld;* and by *Christian, Duke of Brunswick*, Administrator of Halberstadt.[2] They were, however, no match for the brave and virtuous *Tilly*,[3] the

[1] While the Protestants claimed that their defeat might be accounted for by the exhausted condition of the troops after a night's march, the Catholics ascribed their victory to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin. The picture carried during the battle is now at the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria in Rome, the titular church of the late Card. Rauscher, and is still regarded as miraculous. (TR.)

[2] *Soeltl.* The Religious Wars of Germany (also Elizabeth Stuart, wife of Frederic V. of the Palatinate), Hamburg, 1841, 2 pts.

[3] Protestant historians uniformly represent Tilly as a type of cruelty and fanaticism, and rarely omit quoting the words put into his mouth by *Schiller*, to the effect that, after the capture of the city of Magdeburg, some officers of the League, witnessing the horrors perpetrated by the brutal soldiery, chiefly by Pappenheim's Walloons and the Croatian cavalry, and horrified at the terrible scene of carnage, ventured to remind Tilly that he might put a stop to it if he

Hosted by Google

General of the League, and the victorious hero of thirty-six battles, or for *Wallenstein*, the commander of the imperial troops, by both of whom they were repeatedly defeated.

The Palatinate, the hereditary States of Frederic, was taken from him, and, with the consent of the Electors, transferred to Maximilian, the heroic Duke of Bavaria (1623). Frederic's brother-in-law, Christian IV., King of Denmark, aided by James I. of England, marched to the scene of war at the head of his forces; was utterly defeated by Tilly, near *Lutter on the Barenberg*, in the territory of Brunswick (1626), and forced to conclude the Peace of *Lübeck* (1629), by which he bound himself never again to be a party to any confederacy formed against the Emperor of Germany. Encouraged by these victories, Ferdinand II. forbade any religion other than the Catholic to be practiced within his hereditary States. He felt that he might do this with perfect justice, inasmuch as the Protestants were laboring to incite the peasants to insurrection (1626), and had expelled all Catholics from Silesia and Upper and Lower Austria. In compliance with the frequently expressed wish of the princes of the Catholic Church, demanding a settlement of the difficulties growing out of the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, the emperor promulgated, in the year 1629, what is known as the *Restitution Edict*, which, being based upon the principle of common law, "*that one must not be despoiled of his own*," is generally regarded as just. This Edict provided that the *status quo* of the Religious Peace of Passau should be re-established; that all ecclesiastical property should be restored; that *Catholic* and Protestant princes alike might establish and maintain

would. "Return," he replied, "in an hour, and I shall see what I can do; the soldier must have some reward for his danger and toils." See the works of *Fred. Schiller* (Historical, p. 143), tr. by the Rev. *A. T. W. Morrison*, M. A., London, 1872. (Tr.) A true account of the *conflagration of Magdeburg* is given in *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 3, Vol. 11, Vol. 14, and Vol. 42, by *Heising*, Magdeburg not Destroyed by Tilly, and Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, Berlin, 1846. *Bensen*, The Fate of Magdeburg, Schaffhausen, 1842. A true and full characteristic account of Tilly has recently been furnished by Count *Villermont*, Tilly, or the Thirty Years' War (tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ.), Schaffh. 1860. *Onno Klopp*, Tilly during the Thirty Years' War, Stuttg. 1861 sq., 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

their own religion in their respective States; and that Protestant subjects, who desired to emigrate, should be permitted to do so. Owing to some preliminary matters, which it was necessary to settle before putting the Edict in force, its execution was deferred until the year 1631.[1]

Gustavus Adolphus, King *of Sweden*, who had long been wanting an opportunity to turn the troubles of Germany to his personal advantage and the aggrandizement of his crown, and believing that the moment had arrived for active measures on behalf of Protestantism, now seriously threatened, immediately set about making preparations during this interval. The emperor had aided the Poles in their struggle against Sweden, and this Gustavus Adolphus professed to consider a sufficient pretext for declaring war. Assured of the sympathy and support of Richelieu, he marched at the head of a Swedish army into Germany in 1630. But, while pompously professing to seek only "the glory of God and the honor and well-being of Christians," his own proclamation to the Germans, *still extant*,[2] proves that his real object was to place a Protestant prince (his modesty forbade him to mention himself) at the head of the empire.[3] His entire conduct and policy show conclusively that this was his real design. With the aid of the Protestant princes, he gained an important victory over Tilly at Breitenfeld, near Leipsig (1631),

[1] *Henke*, the Protestant Church historian, strangely calls this Edict of Restitution the *death-warrant of Protestantism in Germany*. Could not Protestantism maintain itself in Germany as Catholicism did in England and Ireland under much more trying circumstances? In Germany large portions of the confiscated lands were restored, which was not the case in England and Ireland. The objects covered by the Edict were the two archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Hamburg-Bremen, twelve bishopries, and a large number of monasteries.

[2] Baron von *Aretin*, the illustrious author of "The Relations of Bavaria to Foreign Countries," Passau, 1839, has found this project. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., p. 431 sq., 499 sq. **Droysen* (junior), Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, 1867–71, 2 vols.

[3] *Frederic von der Decken*, George, Duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg, being Documents Supplementary to the Hist. of the Thirty Years' War, according to original sources, derived from the royal archives of Hanover, Hanover, 1833–1834, 3 vols. There are found palpable proofs of the dishonesty of Gustavus Adolphus.

Hosted by Google

and immediately took up his march for Bavaria. Tilly, who met him on the frontier of that country, at the Lech, and gallantly contested his passage, received a severe wound, of which he died at Ingolstadt twenty-five days later, April 20, 1632. His last words were: "In Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; I shall not be confounded forever."

The next step of Gustavus Adolphus was to force the citizens of Augsburg to take the oath of allegiance to the crown of Sweden. The States of the Elector Frederic of the Palatinate he now proposed to regard as *fiefs* of the same crown, and declined to reinstate that prince unless he would consent to hold them as such.

Gustavus Adolphus met his death at the battle of *Lützen*, in Saxony, November 16, 1632. Wallenstein's defeat here was chiefly owing to the superior discipline of his opponents. In the same engagement perished *Pappenheim*, the gallant commander of cavalry, whose last words were: "I die happy, knowing that the sworn enemy of my faith has also this day gone to his account."

Hardly had the danger which threatened Germany been, to all appearances, averted, when the *ambiguous conduct of Wallenstein*[1] and his assassination (Feb. 25, 1634), which is to this day clouded in mystery, still further complicated affairs. The Swedish generals, under the direction of *Bernard*, Duke *of Saxe-Weimar*, and subsidized by the French government, now prosecuted the war with greater energy and more marked success. Through the efforts of *Oxenstierna*, the Swedish chancellor, a confederation of the Protestant States was effected. So blunted had the sense of national honor become in the minds of these princes that they "*very humbly*" begged this parvenu to take the direction of the government into his own hands.

In 1634, the emperor, Ferdinand II., defeated the Swedes near Noerdlingen, thereby detaching from the Protestant al-

[1] *Baron von Aretin*, Wallenstein, being supplements toward a more precise view of his character, Passau, 1846. *Hurter*, Supplements toward a History of Wallenstein, Schaffh. 1855. By the *same*, The Last Four Years of Wallenstein's Life, Vienna, 1862. *Ranke*, Hist. of Wallenstein, 3d ed. (Complete Works, Vol. 23d).

Hosted by Google

liance the Elector of Saxony, to whom he was reconciled by the *Peace of Prague*, concluded in 1635. These events, however, only stimulated the efforts of Richelieu to restore the preponderance of the Protestants in Germany. The victories and reverses were pretty evenly divided, neither side gaining any very decided advantage. Never before had the thriving provinces of Germany been so desolated, and that, too, by the horrors of a civil and religious war, which an ambitious rival nation did its best to incite and protract. When the emperor died in 1637, it was thought these appalling horrors would cease, but through the perfidious policy of France, whose sordid interests were not yet satisfied, they were continued with undiminished atrocity under his son, *Ferdinand III.*, notwithstanding that he had published a general amnesty at the *Diet of Ratisbon* in 1641. From the year 1635 till its close the war was so obviously of a *political* character that *Hippolytus a Lapide* very justly reminded his contemporaries "that since they were fighting for territorial conquests, and not for their faith, they ought in decency to lay aside *the now meaningless pretext of religion*" (*vanus ille religionis praetextus*).[1]

Certain writers, yielding to the influence of some unaccountable fatuation, have endeavored to make the world believe that the object of this war was the *freedom of Germany*, to which, in matter of fact, it was in no wise intended to contribute.

§ 356. *The Peace of Westphalia.*

I. Instrument. pac. Westph., ed. *Berninger*, Monast. 1648; ed. *Meyern*, Hanover, 1734–1736, Götting. 1740, 6 T., fol. Supplements thereto, 3 T., fol., Götting. 1747. Documents of the Treaties of Peace of Osnabrück and Münster, according to authentic sources, Zürich, 1848. *Adam. Adami* (Envoy of Corvey), Arcana P. W., Francof. 1698, ed. *Meyern*, Gotting. 1737.

II. *Pütter*, Spirit of the Peace of Westphalia, Götting. 1795. *Phillips*, Can. Law, Vol. III., p. 462–477. *Struve*, Complete History of the Religious Grievances in the German Empire, Lps. 1722, 2 pts. *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. VIII. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, "The Peace of Westphalia," Vol. 51, year 1863.

[1] Cf. *Hurter*, Ferdinand II., Vol. IX., p. 220. *Onno Klopp*, Prejudiced Fabricators of German History, Freiburg, 1863, pp. 25, 52, and 302.

Hosted by Google

Germany was exhausted, and longed for peace. While both parties were still in fierce conflict with each other, negotiations, looking toward a cessation of hostilities, were opened at Münster and Osnabrück (1645–1648). These were tedious, and were finally brought to a close only on October 24, 1648, when a Treaty of Peace was signed, and its execution guaranteed by *France* and *Sweden*, the two countries that had done most to ruin Germany. As a remuneration for their efforts toward this end, both received large grants of the territory of the Empire. Alsace, with the exception of the bishopric of Strasburg, was annexed to France; Upper Pomerania, the island of Rügen, part of Lower Pomerania, and the cities of Wismar, Bremen, and Verden were added to Sweden; and to both countries a war indemnity of five millions of thalers was paid. The losses of Brandenburg in Pomerania were compensated by the acquisition of the bishoprics of Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Minden, and Camin, as secular principalities; Mecklenburg, in exchange for Wismar, received the bishoprics of Schwerin and Ratzeburg; Brunswick, as a reward for sacrifices made to Sweden, obtained the monasteries of Kroeningen and Walkenried; and the good offices of Hesse-Cassel to the same country were repaid by the cession of the abbey of Hersfeld and other ecclesiastical estates. The change in the character of ecclesiastical property, once it had passed into the hands of civil princes, was now for the first time called "*secularization*."

Owing to the *extravagant demands* of the Protestants, some trouble was experienced in adjusting the *religious difficulties*, but it was finally agreed that the articles of the Treaty of Passau and the Religious Peace of Augsburg should be strictly observed by both parties; that the adherents of each should enjoy *equal rights*, according to the constitutions of their respective States;[2] that in all Imperial Courts and deputations the number of members representing each religious party should be equal; that if the two parties should differ

[1] A town in the province of Westphalia. (Tr.)

[2] *F. M. Bachmann*, Nonnulla de regula aequalitatis ex § I., art. 5, pacis Westphal., Erford, 1792, 4to.

Hosted by Google

from each other in the Imperial Diet, the question should be settled by compromise, and not by ballot; and that the Calvinists, or members of the *Reformed Church*, should have precisely the same relations to Catholics as those professing the Augsburg Confession. But, while bringing peace to the States of the Empire, this Treaty introduced a wholly novel legislation. The inhabitants of the various States no longer enjoyed equal religious rights; and while in some countries Catholics, in others Protestants, were denied the rights of citizenship and freedom of worship, rights which were accorded even to Jews.

This condition of things was brought about by an article in the Treaty investing the *supreme rulers* of the States immediately connected with the Empire with the *right of reforming*[1] the religion of the counts and vassals residing within their *territories*. This *episcopacy of princes*, or the investiture of ecclesiastical powers so extensive in the hands of the civil rulers of countries, soon produced its legitimate results. At first the exercise of these powers was limited to the external organization of the churches (§ 336); but it soon passed far beyond these modest limits, and was stretched to a length to which neither popes nor bishops ever thought of carrying their authority or jurisdiction within the Catholic Church. Thus, for example, the inhabitants of the Palatinate, within the sixty years following the accession of Frederic III., were forced, at the bidding of their successive masters, to change their religion *four different times*.[2]

By a strange inconsistency, the so-called "right of reforming," granted to *princes*, was denied to *imperial cities*. It was ordained that these should preserve the dominant form of religion, and magistrates and citizens were politely informed that they must forego the right enjoyed by them since the

[1] Cum Statibus immediatis cum jure territorii et Superioritatis etiam *jus reformandi religionem* competat, conventum est, hoc idem porro quoque ab utriusque religionis Statibus observari, nullique Statui immediato jus, *quod ipsi ratione territorii et superioritatis in negotio religionis competit*, impedire oportere. (Instrum. Pac. Osnabr., Art. V., § 30.)

[2] †*Remling*, The Work of the Reformation in the Palatinate, Mannheim, 1846.

Hosted by Google

breaking out of the Reformation, of regulating whatever pertained to religion. But, though princes possessed in theory the absolute "right of reforming," in practice it underwent many modifications and limitations.

The condition of affairs on January 1, 1624 (called the *normal year*), was to serve, as a rule, as regards the secularization of ecclesiastical property; so also was the free exercise of religion by Catholics under Protestant, and by Protestants under Catholic princes, to be based upon the existing relations at that fixed point of time. But, while the "right of reforming" was thus limited by the condition existing at a certain date, there were still some important matters left unsettled. Thus, for instance, there could be no question as what the "right of reforming" meant, when applied to subjects or vassals of a different religion from the ruling prince, but the case was very different when they were of the same belief and members of the same church. In countries where the ruling princes were Catholics, there was of course no difficulty, since all Catholics hold that *ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction* are vested, not in secular lords or civil princes, but in the Pope and the bishops, and that, strictly speaking, the "right of reforming" can be exercised only by a particular or general council.[1]

By the provisions of the Treaty, the *Protestants* of both professions had an advantage over Catholics in the application of the "*reservatum ecclesiasticum*," it being provided that all foundations and benefices in the hands of the former since January 1, 1624, should retain their Protestant character, even after they had passed under the authority of a Catholic prince.

Consistently with the condition of affairs in the same year, Catholic bishops were permitted to exercise jurisdiction over the *Catholic*, but not over the Protestant subjects of a Protestant prince, a limitation having been provided in the Recess of 1555. According to the now accepted principles of religious equality, the members of the Imperial Chamber were to

[1] Provincialia Concilia, sicubi omissa sunt, pro moderandis moribus, corrigendis excessibus, controversiis componendis aliisque ex sacris canonibus permissis renoventur. (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIV., cap. 2, de reform.) Cf. Conc. Constant., Sess. XXXIX.

Hosted by Google

be composed of equal numbers of Catholics and Protestants, but the emperor might put two Catholics into places in the Chamber, which it was his right to fill, and he had also the nominating of the four presidents. Against this article of the Treaty the Protestants protested, insisting that whenever measures affecting the rights of both parties came up for discussion, the Chamber should be divided into Senates, composed of *equal* numbers of Protestants and Catholics. Their demand was granted.[1]

As the Treaty contained many articles detrimental to the interests of the Catholic Church, *Fabio Chigi*, the Papal Nuncio, who was at Münster, acting as mediator between France and the emperor, protested against *the objectionable portions*, and called upon the representatives of the Catholic powers to bear him witness that he had had no hand in the making of the obnoxious instrument, and had neither signed it nor given weight to its contents by being present at the conferences. This protest was ratified by Pope *Innocent X.*, who, in his bull *Zelus domus Dei*, refused to acknowledge the articles hostile to the Catholic Church, declaring that whatever either or both of the Treaties contained injurious or prejudicial to the Catholic religion, the divine service, the salvation of souls, the Holy See, the Church of Rome, or other churches, or to ecclesiastical discipline or the clergy, he utterly rejected and pronounced null and void. While, on the one hand, he was sincerely desirous of abstaining from all troublesome interference in the new order of affairs; on the other, he did not wish to be regarded as shaping his policy to suit the exigencies of the times, or to surrender the *unchangeable principles* which have always guided the action of the Holy See.[2]

[1] Instrum. Osnab., art. V., § 54: Caesarea majestas mandabit, ut non solum isto judicio camerali causae ecclesiasticae ut et politicae inter catholicos et acathol. status, vel inter *hos solos* vertentes, vel etiam quando catholicis contra catholicos status litigantibus tertius interveniens acathol. status erit, et vicissim quando acathol. statibus contra ejusdem confessionis status litigantibus tertius interveniens erit catholicus, adjectis ex utraque religione pari numero assessoribus discutiantur et dijudicentur.

[2] For the true meaning and scope of this protest, cf. **Döllinger*, "The Church and the Churches," "The Papacy and the States of the Church," pp. 49–62. *Schmidt*, S. J., Institutiones Jur. eccl. Germ., P. I., pp. 83–93.

Hosted by Google

After the conclusion of this Peace, which annihilated the last vestiges of imperial power; severed the ancient ties that had united the several States; gave a preponderance to foreign influences in the affairs of the empire; and sowed the seeds of the perpetual discords, which at critical moments always broke out afresh, thus adding to the existing troubles, the antagonism of the opposing parties ceased to be political, *resuming again the religious character which it bore in its origin.*[1]

[1] The following observation of *Walter*, in his Manual of Canon Law, 13th ed., p. 628, is important: "The treaties of 1555 and 1648, considered as honest efforts to establish a durable peace between two contending religious parties, are not alone to be highly commended; but, from a political point of view, are wholly justifiable; because, in the then existing condition of affairs, there was no other available means of putting an end to the effusion of blood. But, considered from a legal point of view, they are violations of the rights of the Catholic Church. In the first place, foundations established for purely spiritual and very special purposes are not the property of individuals, but of communities and corporations. Hence, in cases in which whole communities did not embrace the new doctrines, either the estates should have remained in the possession of the Catholics or a compromise should have been effected. Such, however, was not the case. Secondly: When the parties to the treaties disposed of property in actual possession, they made a conveyance, which, both in canon and civil law, required the sanction of either the ordinary of the diocese or the Pope. Thirdly and finally: By these treaties, the contracting parties took upon them, *of their own self-constituted authority*, to dispose of bishoprics and chapters, and to regulate their internal affairs, an exercise which by ancient and recognized law required the authorization of the Sovereign Pontiff."

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER VI.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

§ 357. *The Greek Church under the Turks.*

M. le Quien, Oriens christianus, Par. 1740, 3 T., fol. *Heineccius*, Picture of the Ancient and Modern Greek Church, Lps. 1711, 4to. *Kimmel*, Libri symbolici eccl. Oriental., etc., Jen. 1843 (only expcsitiones fidei Turco-Graeciae!); append. add. *Weissenborn*, ibid. 1850. †*H. J. Schmitt*, Critical History of the Modern Greek and Russian Churches, Mentz, 1846. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism between the East and the West, Vol. I., p. 420–438. *Pitzipios-Bey*, The Oriental Church (Germ., by *Schiel*, Vienna, 1857). *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. IV., p. 760–774; Fr. tr., Vol. 7, p. 247.

The Catholic Church had made many sacrifices to better the condition of the Greek Church, which, since the fall of Constantinople, had felt the weight of persecution and experienced the humiliation of a degrading servitude. Immediately after the capture of the city, the Patriarch's cathedral was destroyed by order of *Mohammed II.*, and a Turkish mosque built on its site; while, during the reign of *Selim I.* (from 1512), the Christians were obliged to surrender their stone churches to the Turks and build others of wood for themselves; and, to crown all, the sultan reserved to himself the right of appointing the *patriarchs*. *Gennadius*, although appointed to the *patriarchate* of *New Rome*, by Mohammed II., was commanded by the same authority to lay down the dignity; and the urgent entreaties of his faithful flock could not alter the decision of the tyrant. In like manner Mohammed sent *Joasaph*, the next occupant of the patriarchal office, into exile, for refusing to sanction an unlawful marriage of a Mohammedan minister to a daughter of an Athenian prince.

The patriarchate itself was often simoniacally obtained. A farcical election was held, the electors being twelve neighboring archbishops, acting under the direction of a Greek, in the pay of the sultan, and never failing to give their votes to the

Hosted by Google

candidate who had offered the highest price for the office. The patriarch-elect was then conducted into the seraglio during a session of the Divan, when he received a costly robe of white silk embroidered with gold, a white charger, and a staff bearing an ivory head, as tokens and insignia of his office. At the close of the ceremony, he paid over a heavy purchase-money, and received from the sultan a letter of approbation (*berat* or *barath*). What with forced resignations, exile, degradation, and strangulation, the patriarchs of Constantinople were seldom able to maintain themselves for any considerable length of time on the throne. From the patriarch the practice of securing their offices by simony passed down through all the inferior grades of the clergy, and, having obtained them in this way, *archbishops*, bishops, and priests alike never failed to indemnify themselves for what the purchase had cost them.

The Mohammedan conquerors thought it prudent, from political considerations, to show a semblance of respect for the external form of the old Greek Church; and hence, besides the patriarch of Constantinople, those of *Alexandria* (at Cairo), of *Antioch* (at Damascus), and of *Jerusalem*, were still permitted to exist. The *patriarch of Constantinople*, being the head of the whole Orthodox Church, styled himself *Ecumenical Patriarch*. The archbishops, holding the next rank in the Greek hierarchy, were chosen by the patriarch of Jerusalem and his synod; and the bishops received their appointments from the archbishops.

As a class, the clergy were illiterate and immoral; took no interest in the welfare of their people; were destitute of every priestly virtue, and showed no disposition to sacrifice themselves in laboring for the religious and social amelioration of their flocks. After that the sultan had conferred upon the clergy certain privileges special to their order, thus drawing a sharp line of distinction between them and other Christian subjects, the condition of the latter was most humiliating. Their taxes were vastly heavier than those paid by the Mohammedans; they were deprived of every right and shorn of every privilege, and nothing was left undone that might humble the pride and crush the spirit of these degenerate

Hosted by Google

Greeks. So mean-spirited and craven had the clergy become that they had not the courage to protest against the methods employed for recruiting the *Janizaries* (Jeni-tsheri, new soldiers), a military force serving as a bulwark to Islamism, and composed of Christian prisoners and those who as children had been taken from their Christian parents and brought up in the faith of Mohammed.

It was not long before the Christian population lost all power of resistance. Their feeble condition was nowhere more apparent than in *Albania*, where the number of Christian inhabitants decreased between the years 1620 and 1650 from 350,000 to 50,000 souls. Among the vast multitude of apostates were to be found many monks and secular priests.

Their condition was somewhat improved at the opening of the eighteenth century, when Peter the Great of Russia (after 1711), *acting from motives of self-interest*, proclaimed himself the protector of the sultan's Christian subjects. His words received practical expression from Catharine II., who insisted on having Article VII. inserted in the Peace of Kutshuk-Kainardji, thereby exacting from the Sublime Porte a promise that the Christian religion should be protected and its churches exempt from violence; and empowering the Russian embassador to take cognizance of all violations of this part of the treaty.

§ 358. *Relations of the Greek Church to the Lutheran, Calvinist, and Catholic Churches.*

Leo Allatius, De Eccles. occidental. et oriental. perpetua consensione, lib. III., cap. 11. See Vol. II., pp. 449 and 810. **Hefele*, Tuebing. Quart. Review, 1843, pp. 541 sq.; and by the *same*, Supplements to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., pp. 444–447.

At first sight it should seem that there could be no possibility of a union between the Greek Church and the Lutheran, so widely different are the fundamental principles of each. Nevertheless, efforts were made in that direction, first by *Joasaph II.*, patriarch of Constantinople (1555–1565), who sent the deacon, *Demetrius Mysius*, to Wittenberg to obtain a knowledge of Protestantism at its very cradle. He received from Melanchthon a Greek translation of the Augsburg Con-

Hosted by Google

fession, by *Dolscius*, and a civil letter for the patriarch, containing expressions of joy, in that "God had preserved the Eastern Church, surrounded by enemies so numerous and so hostile to the Christian name;" and conveying to him the assurance that "Protestants had remained *loyal* to Holy Writ, to the *dogmatic decrees of the Holy Synods*, and to the teachings of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, and the other *Fathers of the Greek Church;* that they rejected and abhorred the scandalous errors of Paul of Samosata, of the Manichaeans, and of all heretics *anathematized* by the Church; that in the same way they cast aside all manner of superstitious practices and idolatrous worship, *introduced by ignorant Latin monks;* and that, therefore, if the evil reports put in circulation against the Protestants, should come to his ears, he should not credit them."[1] The patriarch was too clear-sighted to be duped by these apparently candid avowals, and accordingly sent no answer.

A short time after, the Tübingen theologians, *Jacob Andrea* and *Crusius*, forwarded by Baron *David von Ungnad*, a zealous Protestant, whom the Emperor *Maximilian II.* sent as embassador to the Sublime Porte, a communication to the patriarch, *Jeremias II.* (1574–1581), as remarkable for duplicity and bad faith as that of Melanchthon. The patriarch, after some delay, sent an answer, emphatically repudiating the teachings of Protestantism, specifying such tenets as that man is justified *by faith alone;* that there are but *two* Sacraments; that the *Saints* are not to be invoked; and also the Catholic doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds *from the Father and the Son.* In conclusion, he warned his correspondents against adopting new teachings, and repudiating those contained in the Bible, the *seven Holy Synods, and in the writings of the Fathers;* and begged them to hold whatever the Church holds, *whether that be her written or unwritten teaching.* The theologians sent a reply, explaining and controverting, as occasion required, to which the patriarch rejoined, requesting them for the future to spare him any further *annoyance* of a controversial character (1581), and entreating

[1] In *Crusius*, Turcograecia, p. 557.

Hosted by Google

them to give up errors at once contradictory of Christian truth, and calculated only to draw down upon those who hold them the chastisement of Heaven.[1] Another effort was made by *eleven* of the distinguished Protestant theologians of Würtemberg to continue the correspondence, but to their specious plans for a union of the Churches the patriarch did not deign to reply. A last effort was made by the indefatigable Crusius, who considerately translated into Greek, for the use of the Eastern clergy, a sufficient number of Lutheran sermons to fill four folio volumes; but the *Greek Synod* of Jerusalem (1672) very unfeelingly characterized his labors and those of others in a similar field as the impertinent and obtrusive officiousness of the Lutheran theologians of Tübingen.

The attempt made to bring about an understanding between the Greek and Reformed Churches must seem still more extraordinary. The first to undertake the difficult task was *Cyril Lucaris*, a native of Candia (ancient Crete), then belonging to the Republic of Venice. He was educated at Padua, but coming, in the course of his travels, to Geneva, he entered into close relations with the Reformed theologians, and, on his return to Greece, became very much attached to *Meletius Pega*, patriarch of Alexandria, by whom he was ordained, and who was one of the most furious enemies of the Church of Rome. Having become protector of Poland, Meletius placed Cyril over the school of *Wilna*, in Lithuania, and the latter, taking advantage of his position, set himself to do his best to break off the negotiations then going forward with a view to a union of the Russo-Polish bishops of the Greek rite with the Roman Church. After the death of Meletius, Cyril succeeded, it is said, by bribery, in having

[1] Acta et scripta Theologor. Wirtemb. et Patriarch. Jeremiae, Vitebergi, 1584, 4to. It is proper to draw attention to the fact that the letters which compromise the Lutheran theologians are wanting in this collection; but they may be found in *Crusius*, Turcograecia. Cf. *Schelstrate*, Acta eccl. orient. contra Lutheri haeresin. Romae, 1739; *Schnurrer*, de Actis inter Tübing. theolog. et patriarch. Constantinop. (Oration. acad., ed. *Paulus*, Tüb. 1828; *Hefele*, Suppl. to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., p. 445–460.

Hosted by Google

himself placed upon the patriarchal throne of Alexandria (1602). He at once opened a correspondence with *Cornelius van Hagen*, the Dutch embassador at Constantinople, and a zealous Calvinist, laying before that functionary a plan for making the Greek Church Calvinistic. The diplomatic agents of England and Sweden entered warmly into the scheme, and, in consequence, Cyril began to correspond on the subject with a Dutch preacher named *John Uytenbogaert*, and with *George Abbot*, Archbishop of Canterbury. To the latter he even sent a young and promising Greek, named *Metrophanes Kritopolos*, who, after having studied Protestant theology in England, was to spend some time in Germany on his way home. The letters that passed between Cyril and another of his correspondents, the Dutch statesman, *David le Leu de Wilhelm*, are singular productions. Finally, after many unsuccessful intrigues, Cyril reached the object of his ambition, when, in 1621, he was transferred to the *patriarchal see of Constantinople*. It is said that *Neophyte II.*, the last occupant of the see but one previously to the accession of Cyril, had, from the opening of the seventeenth century, favored a union of the Eastern with the *Roman* Church, and that the *Jesuit* missionaries resident at Constantinople had entered actively into the project. Cyril, though banished to the island of Rhodes for his explicit avowal of Calvinistic principles, was a man of too fertile a genius to lose heart in the hour of disaster, and, to effect his recall, he made a lavish but judicious expenditure of money, an agent which he uniformly employed and always found potent to accomplish his designs. To further his purposes, he established a printing-office at Constantinople in the year 1627; and, by duplicity and the aid of unscrupulous friends, finally succeeded in ridding himself of the annoying presence of the Jesuits. In their stead, the Genevese sent (1628) him *Anthony Léger*, a Reformed preacher, who labored zealously for eight years to Calvinize the Greek Church, but with indifferent success. In 1629, Cyril drew up *in Latin* a *Calvinistic* Confession of Faith (*Confessio fidei*), which he subsequently caused to be translated into *Greek* and scattered among the people (1631). The Greek bishops at once took the alarm. Cyril had again to endure persecutions and to go

Hosted by Google

into exile (1634); but again he purchased his return by bribery, and in 1637 was reinstated without being obliged to abjure the teachings of the "*Most Holy*" Calvin. But now the indignation of both clergy and people against *the man*, who dared to set up his own private opinions in room of the common belief, and to destroy the ancient reputation of the Greek Church for orthodoxy, could no longer be restrained. He was judged and condemned as a heretic by a synod held at Constantinople, and being, moreover, suspected of favoring an invasion of the Turkish empire by the Cossacks belonging to the Greek Church, was strangled by order of the Grand Seigneur, and his body cast into the sea. His Confession was condemned and anathema passed upon himself by a synod held at Constantinople shortly after (September, 1638). Among those condemned with Cyril was *Metrophanes*, Patriarch of Alexandria, whom the former had sent to England. But the heretical opinions of Cyril continued to live and spread after their author had passed away. They were frequently condemned by his successors, and by many synods, of which that presided over by *Dositheus*, Patriarch of Jerusalem, was the most important (1672).[1]

To prevent any further attempts to unite the Greek with the Reformed Church, the Greek bishops were required to subscribe to a Confession of Faith, drawn up by *Peter Mogila*, Archbishop of Kiew. This Confession, which sets forth the fundamental and unchangeable teachings of both the Greek and the Latin Churches, is vigorous and precise in language, and practical rather than speculative in character, differing in this respect from former subtle and ambiguous formulas of faith. It also contains a summary of the teaching concerning the three theological virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity.[2]

[1] Synodus Jerosolymitana adv. Calvinistas haereticos, interprete Domno M. F., ed. II., Par. 1678. Monuments authentiques de la relig. des Grecs par *J. Aymon*, or Lettres anecdotes de *Cyr. Lucaris* et du concile de Jérusalem, La Haye, 1708, 4to. On the other hand, Abbé *Renaudot*: Contre les calomnies et faussetés du livre intitulé: "Monuments," Par. 1709. Cf. *Hefele*, Suppl. Vol. I., p. 463–476; and *Pichler*, Patriarch Cyril Lucaris and His Age, Munich, 1862.

[2] Orthodoxa conf. cath. atque apost. Eccles. orient., ed. *Hoffmann*, Vratisl. 1751.

Hosted by Google

In spite of the alienation existing between the Greek and Latin Churches, naturally resulting from the failure of so many attempts at union, the conversion of a large number of Greeks inspired fresh hopes, and, with a view to facilitate a reconciliation, Pope Gregory XIII. founded at Rome a college for the education of young Greeks,[1] who, on their return home, were to labor to restore their countrymen to unity. One of these, *Leo Allatius*, was a native of Chios, and though only a layman, filled several important clerical positions, both at Rome and Naples (after 1610), and distinguished himself by his active zeal; but his efforts, like those of so many others, were fruitless. The wall of separation between the Greek and Latin Churches is broader and deeper than would appear at first sight, and has been mainly built up by the characteristics peculiar to the formation and development of each.[2]

§ 359. *The Graeco-Russian Church under its own Patriarchs.*

For Lit., see § 357. *P. Rycaut*, The Present State of the Armenian and Greek Churches, London, 1679. *A. N. Murawieff*. Hist. of the Church of Russia, transl. (in Russian, Petersburg, 1838) by *Blackmore*, Oxford, 1842. *Strahl*, Supplem. to the Ch. H. of Russia, Halle, 1827. *Ullmann*, On Strahl (Stud. and Critic., 1831, Pt. II.) Lettres sur les offices divins de l'Église d'Orient, traduites du Russe, Petersburg, 1837 (Germ. by *Muralt*, Lps. 1838). Russian Studies on Theology and History, ed. by *M. Brühl*, Münster, 1858 sq. *Philaret*, Hist. of the Church of Russia (transl. into Germ. by *Blumenthal*, Frankfort, 1872, two parts). †*Jno. Fr. Henry Schlosser*, The Eastern Orthodox Church of Russia and the European West, Heidelberg, 1845. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism, etc., Vol. II. *Wallace's* Russia, New York, 1877.

The Russian, being the daughter of the Greek Church, has been, like the parent, hostile to the Catholic Church, and destitute of all spiritual life. The Russian Church, however, did not remain long dependent upon the Greek. The geographical situation of Russia, the peculiarities of her political structure, her interests always antagonistic to those of the Greek Empire, and, as time went on, to those of the Turks also,

[1] See § 344, p. 362.

[2] For his works, see Vol. II., pag. 449, and pag. 814, note 2. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 168 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. I., p. 163; and *Gengler*, The Principle of Faith in the Greek Church, Bamberg, 1829. See *Tüb.* Quart. Review, year 1831, p. 652 sq.

Hosted by Google

early tended to withdraw her Church from dependence upon that of Constantinople. Hence, when the capital was transferred from Kiew to Moscow, so was the Metropolitan see also. The preëminence of this see may be said to have been formally recognized when, at a conference of all the Russian bishops at Moscow, *Jonas*, the appointee of the Grand Duke, was declared *Metropolitan of Russia.* The Russian Church, however, was still in a measure dependent upon that of Constantinople, as is evident from the fact that the Metropolitan, *Isidore*, accompanied the Greek bishops to the Council of *Florence*, held for the avowed purpose of bringing about a union between East and West; but an important step toward complete separation had been taken, and the fall of Constantinople (1453) did but hasten an event which was certain to take place sooner or later. Moreover, in the measure in which the ties binding the Russian Church to that of Constantinople were loosed, in the same measure did the influence and authority of the Grand Duke in ecclesiastical affairs increase. Hence, in the sixteenth century, the *Tsar Ivanovicz* made an attempt to render the Church of Russia wholly independent, by investing one of his bishops with the *patriarchal dignity.*

The Tsar found a pliant instrument of his will in Jeremias II., Patriarch of Constantinople, who, having come to Russia in 1585, and being very much in need of money, participated in a synod, in which he gave his consent that *Moscow* should be regarded as the *third Rome;*[1] that *Job of Rostow* should be appointed its *Patriarch;* and that the governing body of the Russian Church should consist solely of four metropolitans, six archbishops, and eight bishops (1588). The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, sixty-five metropolitans, and eleven Greek archbishops approved of this organization. But, while the Russian Church as such was practically distinct from the Greek and independent of it, the Muscovite Patriarchs continued, until the year 1657, to request the Patriarchs of Constantinople to confirm them in their office. Finally, in the year 1660, the Russian envoy at Constantinople obtained

[1] *Karamsin*, Vol. IX., p. 181. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

from the Patriarch, *Denys II.*, and other Greek Patriarchs, a formal authorization, empowering the Russian clergy to choose their own Patriarchs, and dispensing with the confirmation of the election by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Considered, both from a *political* and religious point of view, the office of Patriarch of Moscow from this time forth assumed a national character, grew in importance, and increased in influence. Those who held it were naturally regarded as persons of great consideration, and so powerful did they become, that at the end of the seventeenth century, when their authority was most respected, they roused the apprehensions and excited the jealousy of *Peter the Great.*[1]

Some efforts were likewise made to bring about a union between the Russian Church and the Roman, chiefly by Leo X., Clement VII., and Gregory XIII.[2] The Tsar, *Ivan Wassilievicz* (1533–1584), having been defeated by the Poles, and, anxious to secure the assistance of the Emperor and the mediation of the Pope, with a view of conciliating them, professed a desire to be reconciled with the Church of Rome (1581). Eager to turn the favorable dispositions of the Tsar to the best account, Gregory XIII. sent *Anthony Possevino*,[3] a Jesuit, to Russia as his representative. A conference was held, at which Ivan assisted; but having learned that the articles of the treaty of peace were unfavorable, he broke off the negotiations, and all hopes of union were extinguished. The efforts of this accomplished Roman diplomatist were more successful in some of the Russian provinces, which, together with Lithuania, passed under the dominion of the Poles.

As the Patriarchs of Moscow had uniformly manifested an unfriendly spirit to those of Kiew, the latter were by no means desirous of continuing in the obedience of the former. Hence *Rahoza*, Metropolitan of Kiew, who had suffered exceptional indignities at the hands of the Patriarchs Jeremias and Job,

[1] Cf. below, § 385.

[2] Condition of the Catholic Church of both rites in Poland and Russia, from Catharine II. to our own days, etc., by *Augustine Theiner*, Priest of the Oratory, Augsburg, 1841, 2 vols. The second volume consists of documentary proofs.

[3] *Ant. Possevini* Moscovia, Viln. 1586; Antv. 1587.

Hosted by Google

proposed to the bishops of his province to unite with Rome. A synod was held at *Brzesc*, at which a formal act of union was drawn up (December 2, 1593). In obedience to the decision of a second synod, a deputation was sent to Rome, and a union effected on the basis of the Council of Florence, and on condition that certain concessions should be made in favor of ancient usages.[1] This happy event was announced by Pope *Clement VIII.*, in the bull "*Magnus Dominus et laudabilis*"[2] He also confirmed the Metropolitan for the time being in the exercise of the rights of jurisdiction attached to his office (February 23, 1596), which included the appointment and confirmation of bishops for the dioceses within his province, on condition, however, that the Metropolitan himself should, through the Papal Nuncio in Poland, ask for his own confirmation from the Holy See.

Notwithstanding the fierce persecution raised against the unionists by the Ruthenian Patriarch, the bonds uniting Kiew to Rome were still more closely drawn, under the Metropolitan, *Rudski* (1613–1625), to whom *Paul V.* granted permission to send four young men to the Greek college lately founded in the Holy City (1615).

On the other hand, in the year 1633, *Peter Mogila* was elected orthodox Metropolitan of Kiew, and approved by Ladislaus IV., who, dreading the latinizing influence of the Roman monks in the schools established to promote the union, assumed the control of both the common and higher education of the orthodox community. In order to confirm the members of the Oriental Church in their own belief, and to strengthen their hostility to all encroachments, whether from a Catholic or Protestant quarter, he composed a *Russian Catechism* (1642), which was accepted by all the associated Patriarchs of the Greek Church as containing the teachings of the Oriental Catholic Church.

[1] Jura et privilegia genti Ruthenae cath. a Max. Pontificibus Poloniaeque Regibus concessa, Lemberg, 1787.

[2] Cf. the important work of the Polish Jesuit, *Piotr. Skarga*, o jednosci Kosciola Bozego pod jednym Pasterzem: i o Greckiem i Ruskiem od tej jednosci odstapieniu (dedicated to Sigismund III.), Warsz, 1590; and *Theiner*, Pt. I., p. 95 sq., and Pt. II., p. 12–36.

Hosted by Google

§ 360. *The Monophysites and Nestorians.*

Renaudot, Hist. Alexandrinor. patriarchar. Jacobitar., Paris, 1712, 4to. *J. J. Assemanni*, Dissert. de Syris Nestorianis. Cf. *Raynald.* ad an. 1553, nro. 43 sq.; an. 1562, nro. 28 sq. See the Journal *Morgenland*, year V., 1842.

The sects which originated in the Nestorian, Monophysite, and Monotholite heresies, and withdrew from the obedience of the Oriental Church, have ever since continued to drag out a miserable existence. Communities of Monophysites, commonly called *Jacobites*, are scattered here and there in considerable numbers over Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylon. They have a special Patriarch of their own, to whom they render obedience, and under him are a primate and several archbishops and bishops. There are also Jacobites in *Egypt*, where they are called *Copts*, and are subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. They are likewise quite numerous in *Abyssinia*[1] and *Armenia*.

Many attempts have been made by the Catholic Church to bring back these erring children to the unity of faith. The only considerable success achieved, however, was in the case of the Abyssinians, who, having received timely and efficient succor from the Portuguese in their struggle against the Mohammedans, in 1525, were favorably disposed to listen to overtures. Through the efforts of Father *Bermudez* and the Jesuits, the Emperor *Seltam Seghed* was induced to break off relations with the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria (after 1607), after which he, together with his step-brother and the most considerable men of his court, solemnly entered the Catholic Church (1626). He recognized the Jesuit, *Alphonso Mendez*, as Patriarch, and the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Universal Church. But the popular discontent evoked by this measure, and assiduously encouraged by the monks and hermits, grew daily more threatening, and culminated in an insurrection, which continued into the reign of *Seghed Basilides* (from 1632), by whom the Patriarch and the Jesuit mission-

[1] *La Croze*, Hist. du christ. d'Abyssinie, La Haye, 1739; Danzig, 1740. *Schnurrer*, de Eccles. Maronitica, Tüb. 1810 sq., Pt. II., 4to. Cf. *Ami de la religion*, new series, 1841, p. 750.

Hosted by Google

aries were expelled the country, and all relations with Rome broken off (1634).

The Catholic Church was also in a measure successful in her missionary labors among the *Armenians*,[1] among whom there had always existed a more ardent faith and a greater love of learning than among any of the other Oriental sects. To the Armenians belong the religious body known as the *Mechitarists*, a name derived from the Abbot *Mechitar* (i. e. Comforter) *da Pietro*. Born at Sebaste, in Armenia Minor, in 1676, Mechitar was brought up under the care of an Armenian priest, and early developed a great love for study and a preference for the quiet of cloistral life. Led to Europe by a desire of knowledge, he experienced the trials and disappointments common to men in the pursuit of learning under difficulties; but the enthusiasm he brought to his task, and the hope of realizing a project he had for some time entertained, of establishing a literary academy for the Armenian nation, bore him up in his moments of depression, and carried him forward when his heart was light. In 1701 he founded at Constantinople a religious community, whose members were to devote themselves specially to diffusing a knowledge of the ancient language and literature of Armenia. He subsequently removed to the Morea, but forced, in consequence of the war between the Turks and Venetians, to surrender (1715) the convent he built (from 1703) on that peninsula, with so much toil and trouble, he withdrew to the small island of *San Lazzaro*, near Venice, on which he once more established himself and his community (1717–1740).[2] His monks, to whom he gave the Rule of St. Benedict, encouraged by the example, and emulating the zeal of their founder,

[1] †*Steck*, The Liturgy of the *Catholic* Armenians, transl. fr. the Arm. into Germ, and put in comparison with other ancient liturgies, especially those of SS. Basil and Chrysostom, Tüb. 1844.

[2] The convent bears the following inscription, written in the Latin and Armenian languages: "Fuit hoc monasterium totum tempore Petri Mechitar ex Sebaste primi Abbatis exstructum an. 1740." See the description of a visit made to the establishment of San Lazzaro of the Mechitarists, and the Life of Mechitar, in *Illgen's* Hist. and Theol. Review, 1841, p. 143–168. Cf. *Boné*, Le Convent de St. Lazare à Venise, ou Histoire succincte de l'Ordre des Méchitaristes Arméniens, Paris, 1837.

Hosted by Google

devoted themselves to the work of translating and publishing in excellent editions the Armenian classics in the languages of the West, and similarly the classics of the West in the language of Armenia. These labors they continued after the death of Mechitar, in 1749, and they have since established communities in *Vienna* (1811) and *Paris*.

The *Maronites* (Monothelites?) of Mount Lebanon, on the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in the twelfth century, entered into communion with the Church of Rome; but when that kingdom was destroyed, two centuries later, they ceased for a time to have any intercourse with Western Christendom. Their relations to the Holy See were again renewed at the Council of Florence (1445), and perfected in the latter half of the sixteenth century, when a college was founded at Rome (after 1584) for the education of their clergy. In this and their home-college of *El Chasir*, the Maronites labor zealously and perseveringly, but with no attempt at display, to cultivate and promote the various branches of Eastern and Western learning. Although in union with Rome, they are permitted to have their own Patriarch; to use the ancient Syriac language in their liturgy; to communicate in both kinds; and their clergy, if married before taking priest's orders, may retain their wives. As a proof of their complete union with the Latin Church, the Maronites, at a *plenary council* held in 1736, formally subscribed the *Decrees of the Council of Trent* in the presence of the Papal Legate.

The *Nestorians* or *Chaldean Christians*, called in East India *Christians of St. Thomas*, are governed by two Patriarchs, one of whom resides in a convent near *Mosul*, in Mesopotamia, and the other at *Ormia*, in Persia. The former has uniformly styled himself *Mar Elias*, since the year 1559; and the latter, since the year 1575, has similarly styled himself *Mar Simon*. Their churches were once spread over Tartary, India, and even China. Efforts were made by Popes Pius IV. and Paul V. to restore them to the common center of Christian unity. A great schism took place in their body in the sixteenth century, when those in the obedience of the Patriarch of Ormia returned to the unity of the Latin Church.

Hosted by Google

SECOND EPOCH.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA DOWN TO MODERN TIMES, 1648–1878.

PART I.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789)—PREVALENCE OF FALSE POLITICAL AND SCIENTIFIC THEORIES.

§ 361. *Sources and Works—Summary.*

I. Bullar. Roman., continued from Clement XIII., by *Barbieri*, Rom. 1835 sq. Acta historico-eccl., Weim. 1736–1758, 24 vols. Nova acta hist. eccl., Weim. 1758–1773, 12 vols. Acta hist. eccl. nostri temporis, Weim. 1774–1787, 12 vols. Repertory to serve Modern Ch. H. (Index on all the above-mentioned), Weimar, 1790. Reports, Documents, and Statements to supply Modern Ch. H., Weimar, 1789–1793, 5 vols. *Collectio Lacensis*, Acta et decreta concilior. recent. ab an., 1682–1789, Friburgi Brisgav. 1871 sq., T. I. *Walch*, Modern Hist. of Religion, Lemgo, 1771–1783, 9 vols.; continued by *Planck*, Lemgo, 1787–1793, 3 vols. *Vater*, Cultivation of Modern Ch. H., Berlin, 1820 sq, 2 vols. Hist. and Theol. Review, edited by *Illgen*, from 1832; by *Niedner*, from 1846; by *Kahnis*, from 1866.

II. By "*some one*," Essay of a Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Lps. 1776 sq., 3 vols. *Schlegel*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Heilbron, 1784 sq., 2 vols.; and by *Fraas*, Vol. 3d, Pt. I. (both being in continuation of Mosheim's). Cf. *Schroeckh*, Ch. H. since the Reformation, Pt. VI.–IX. *Hagenbach*, Hist. of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 3d ed., Lps. 1856, 2 pts., 4th revised ed., Lps. 1871, 1872; Engl. tr., by Rev. *J. F. Hurst*, D.D., New York, 1869. (Tr.) *Baur*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century (Vol. IV., p. 476–679, of the complete work). †**Huth*, Essay of a Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Augsburg, 1807–1809, 2 vols. †*Robiano*, Continuation de l'histoire de l'église de *Berault-Bercastel* depuis, 1721–1830 (Par. 1836, 4 T.), T. 1. †*Henrion*, Hist. générale de l'église pendant les XVIII.–XIX. siècles, Par. 1836, T. I. †*Capefigue*, L'église pendant les 4 derniers siècles, T. 2 et 3. *Rohrbacher*, Hist. univ. de l'église, T. 26 et 27. *F. Ancillon*, Tableau des révolutions du système polit. de l'Europe depuis la fin du 15 siècle, Berl. 1803 sq., 4 T.; Germ. by *Mann*, Berlin, 1804, 3 vols. *Schlosser*, Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, Heidelberg, 1836–1842, 3 vols. (to 1788). Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol.

Hosted by Google

XVI. *Gfroerer*, Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, published by *Weiss*, Schaffh., 1862 sq., 3 vols. *Cesare Cantù*, Universal History, Germ. by *Bruehl*, Vols. XI. and XII.

No sooner had Protestantism secured political recognition, and consolidated its strength, than the influence of the principles of *pure state secularism*, so recklessly applied and consistently carried out in the Treaty of Westphalia, by Catholic and Protestant princes alike, became painfully apparent in the domain of both science and art. An utterly selfish and grasping policy, unrestrained by either human laws or supernatural principles, began to prevail. Under pretense of desiring to preserve the balance of power in Europe, the more powerful princes obtained by fraud or seized by violence territories which their weaker neighbors were unable to defend. To such frivolous and unscrupulous rulers the honest, straightforward policy set forth by *Fénélon* in the Telemachus was in the last degree distasteful.

In consequence of the conflicts resulting from such principles, the Houses of Bourbon and Hapsburg seized conjointly Southern Europe; and Prussia, now raised to the rank of a kingdom, began to play a prominent part in European affairs. After the return of the Electors of Saxony to the Catholic Church, Prussia, assuming the office of protector of Protestantism, introduced into the politics and religion of Germany the principles of Erastianism. On the other hand, Poland was dismembered; Russia began to take a prominent and dangerous part in the political affairs of Western Europe; and Protestant England wrested the scepter of the seas from the Catholic powers, and reduced the kingdom of Ireland to the condition of a province.

To offset these extraordinary events in the political domain, there were no cheering results in the *religious;* the evidences of spiritual life and growth, even during the eighteenth century, when the productions of modern national literature were at once numerous and of exceptional merit, both in England and France, being neither important in themselves nor yet giving promise of better things. In every Catholic country, with the exception of France, the humiliating issue of the great religious conflicts produced a spirit of apathy and

Hosted by Google

indifference, on the one hand, and on the other a haughty arrogance in *Catholic* princes, which they displayed in a readiness to quarrel with Popes and persecute Jesuits.

Again, Protestantism produced and fostered a radical and aggressive *Rationalism*, out of which issued the shallow and senseless philosophy of that age, whose single aim seems to have been to destroy the faith of mankind in the divine character of revelation. This rationalistic tendency ultimately exercised a most disastrous influence on the intellectual life of European countries, notably of France and Germany, where it was mainly instrumental in cultivating and creating a taste for that stupid *mock-enlightenment* which *Claudius* satirizes with caustic severity in the Wandsbeck Messenger. (See § 378.)

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

§ 362. *Popes of the Seventeenth Century.*

Guarnacci, Vitae et res gestae Romanor. Pontiff. et Cardinal. a Clem. X. usque ad Clem. XI., Rom. 1751, 2 T. f. *Ant. Sandini*, Vitae Pontiff. Rom. ex antiq. monum. collectae, Patav. 1739, 8vo; Bamberg, 1753, 8vo. Storia critico-chronologica di Rom. Pontefici (to Clement XIII.) e di generali e provinciali concilii scritta da *Giuseppe Abbate Piatti*, Napoli, 1765–1770. *Bower*, Hist. of the Popes, revised by *Rambach*, Vol. X., Pt. II. *Ranke*, Hist. of the Papacy during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Vol. III. Hist. of the Popes, by *Haas*, p. 608 sq.; by *Groene*, Vol. II., p. 400 sq.

The papal power received a rude and terrible shock during the pontificate of *Innocent X.* In concluding the Peace of Westphalia, the Court of Rome was utterly ignored by both Catholic and Protestant princes; most of the ecclesiastical property of Germany, including abbeys and bishoprics, was secularized; and the relations of the civil to the spiritual power completely severed. The influence of the Church in the affairs of State and in political movements entirely ceased. By losing its political prestige, the Holy See lost also much of its moral ascendancy and consideration with the people of Europe; and there was abundant reason to fear that these unparalleled acts of aggression might end in an attack upon the papacy itself, and in an attempt to fetter the Pope in the legitimate exercise of the essential functions of his office. To these encroachments upon his privileges and violations of his rights, Innocent could offer only a feeble and ineffectual protest.

If the events of the closing epoch were disheartening to the Sovereign Pontiff, the conditions which characterized the one just opening were calculated to fill his mind with just alarm. While some of the worldly-minded *bishops* gave him but a feeble support, and others became his open and avowed enemies, *Catholic princes*, and especially those of the Houses

Hosted by Google

of Bourbon and Hapsburg, who tyrannized over a great portion of Europe, were more shameless in their treatment of him and more malicious in their hostility than even the Protestants themselves.

Innocent was succeeded by Cardinal Fabio Chigi, who took the name of *Alexander VII.* (1655–1667). The severity of his morals, his aversion to pomp and luxury, his prudence, and his capacity for business seemed to promise that his reign would be more happy and prosperous than the one just closed had been. But the hopes built upon the talents and virtues he had displayed as a cardinal and diplomatist were prevented from being realized by the fault of the Pontiff himself. He called his grasping relations to Rome, and when he appeared in public it was with a pomp and splendor such as had never before been witnessed or even thought of in that city of magnificent displays. He had, however, the unexpected and gratifying pleasure of learning that *Christina*, Queen of Sweden, and daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, the great Protestant hero, had abjured the creed of her father and embraced the Catholic faith, first privately at Brussels, and afterward solemnly and publicly in the church of the Franciscans at *Innsbruck*. From her infancy up she had been deeply and favorably impressed with the beauty of many Catholic practices; and as she grew in years, the solemn grandeur of the Catholic Church, her worship and her ritual, inspired in her soul feelings of reverence and awe. In this frame of mind, she came upon the words of Cicero, "*that possibly all the opinions of men concerning religion might be false, but that more than one of them could be true was impossible*," [1] the truth of which nearly overpowered her and opened out to her a serious train of thought. This led her to inquire which was the true religion. That God should have left man without such seemed to her inconceivable; for to say that the Author of our being had implanted in the heart and conscience a want that could not be satisfied, was very like taxing Him with a cruel tyranny. Having found in the Catholic Church the true religion so earnestly sought, she forthwith hastened to carry into effect

[1] De natura Deorum, 1, 2.

Hosted by Google

the promise she had made while still in search of it. "O, my God," she was wont to say, "Thou knowest how often I have besought Thee, in language unintelligible to other minds, to give me light; and how I have promised to obey Thy call at any cost, even the sacrifice of my fortune and my life." She laid down the crown of Sweden, which she could not wear as a Catholic, and was unwilling to remain in a country whose sovereignty she had transferred to another. At the Pope's invitation, she came to Italy, and visiting Loreto, placed her scepter and crown in the shrine of Our Lady as a thank-offering. But, while laying aside the titles and functions of royalty, she retained her naturally haughty, and at times despotic, manner, which some of those about her, both at Rome and Fontainebleau, learned to their cost. As time went on, however, her temper became more even, her mind more composed, her character more amiable, and her manners more engaging. Being a woman of extraordinary talents and unusual acquirements, she drew about her a number of artists and savants, upon whom she exercised no little influence, and in this way did much to promote the progress of many branches of science and art. She died at Rome, April 19, 1689, and received the exceptional honor of a tomb in St. Peter's Church. Another conversion, very similar to Christina's in many respects, was that of the scholarly *Ernest*, Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels.[1]

But if these events brought comfort to the heart of the Pontiff, there were others that gave him no little pain and annoyance. As nuncio at the Conference of Münster, Alexander had given offense to France; and, after his accession to the papacy, France in turn, under the governments of Cardinal *Mazarin* († 1661), and especially of *Louis XIV.*, settled the score by causing him all the trouble they decently could,

[1] *Grauert*, Christina of Sweden and her Court, Bonn, 1837 sq., 2 vols. *Ranke*, Roman Pontiffs, Vol. III., p. 77–103. "Digression on Christina of Sweden." Relation de tout ce qui se passa entre le Pape Alex. et le roi de France, Col. 1670. *Desmarais*, Histoire des démêlés de la cour de France avec la cour de Rome, Par. 1706, 4to. Poetical Essays of this Pope: *Philomathi*, labores juveniles, 1656, f. *Raess*, Bp. of Strasburg, Converts, Vol. VII., p. 62 sq. Concerning Landgrave Ernest, cf. ibidem, Vol. VI., p. 465 sq.

Hosted by Google

thus clouding and embittering his life. It would seem that Louis gave formal instructions to the *Duke of Créqui*, his embassador, to heap indignities upon the Pope. There is no other way of adequately accounting for the extraordinary conduct of the embassador himself and the ruffians of his retinue, which so irritated the Pope's body-guard that, smarting under the insult, they refused to respect the sacredness of the hôtel of the French Embassy (1662). This so incensed Louis that he ordered the papal envoys to quit France under escort; caused the papal city of Avignon and the territory of Venaissin to be occupied by his troops; and dispatched an army into Italy to obtain satisfaction. The treaty of Pisa followed (1664), the humiliating terms of which the Pope had no alternative but to accept. Alexander, however, renewed friendly relations with the Republic of Venice; obtained from it the restoration of the confiscated property of the Congregation of the Canons Regular of the Holy Ghost, which he devoted to defraying the expenses of the war against the Turks, and sought and received permission for the banished Jesuits to return.[1] Finally, Alexander erected many magnificent structures, which largely contributed to the embellishment of Rome. Among these were the Archigymnasium of the Sapienza, which he enriched with a splendid library, and the collonade surrounding the piazza or square before St. Peter's Church. The costliness of these and other improvements, together with the rapacity of his relatives, exhausted his resources, and led to financial embarrassment.

Clement IX. (Rospigliosi, 1667–1669), like his predecessor, was a lover of letters and a poet; but, unlike him, he was a tolerable financier, and was partially successful in repairing the disordered state of the papal exchequer. He advanced large sums of money to the Republic of Venice to enable it to prosecute a war against the Turks. He was mainly instrumental in bringing about the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1668), thus reconciling France and Spain; and he impressed upon the mind of Louis XIV. the conviction that his real

[1] See page 365 sq.

Hosted by Google

interests, his true glory, and the welfare of his soul all demanded that he should restrain his lust for conquest.

The kingdom of Portugal had been independent since the time of John IV. (1641), but the Pope, not wishing to give offense to the Spanish sovereigns, declined to recognize it. Clement, putting such notions aside, gave it a formal recognition, acknowledging the reigning prince, Dom Pedro, as its king, and confirming the bishops appointed by that sovereign. He also took a lively interest in the foreign missions, and, among other regulations drawn up by him for the guidance of the missionaries, was one forbidding them for the future to engage in commercial enterprises of any kind. The news that the island of Candia (Crete) had been taken by the Turks, a disaster which he had done so much to avert, caused him such pain that he died of grief, December 9, 1669.

After his death the papal throne remained vacant for five months, when *Emilio Altieri*, then in his eightieth year, was elected, and took the name of *Clement X.* (1670–1676). This pontificate marks the beginning of an era still more disastrous than that of preceding ones in the history of the Popes. Following the example set them by the King of France, the Catholic sovereigns of other countries sought to strip the Holy Father of all influence and to seize the revenues of the Church in their respective States. With a view to aiding the Poles in their struggle against the Turks, Clement opened negotiations with the Tsar, *Alexei Michaelowicz*, who sent an embassy to Rome to obtain from the Pope the title of Emperor. It was during this reign that the question of the *Right of Regalia* arose in France, which afterward became so celebrated and so productive of evil. By the Right of Regalia was meant an abusive custom introduced into France, by which the crown claimed the revenues of vacant bishoprics and the collation of simple benefices, the disposal of which in justice belonged to the incoming bishops. This right, at first restricted to such churches as had been founded by the Kings of France, had been extended during the reign of Henry IV. to all the churches in the kingdom. This violation of ecclesiastical rights, which only the two bishops of *Pamiers* and *Alais* had the courage to resist, was confirmed

Hosted by Google

by Louis XIV. in two edicts, published respectively in 1673 and 1674. Clement died before the close of the controversy.

His successor, *Innocent XI.* (Odescalchi, 1676–1689), was a man of rare ability and an avowed enemy of nepotism.[1] He published a number of very useful decrees on discipline, and exercised unusual discrimination in the appointment of bishops. To remedy the disordered condition of the finances of the States of the Church, he placed at the disposal of the exchequer all the offices and emoluments hitherto in the hands of the nephews of preceding Popes. The residences of foreign embassadors had been, previously to this reign, privileged places of asylum for criminals, and Innocent, by withdrawing the privilege, involved himself in heated controversies with the different courts of Europe. Most of the princes, however, yielded their claim on receiving full explanations from the Pope. Louis XIV. neither asked nor waited for explanations, and his embassador and suite, to show their contempt of papal authority, carried themselves more like soldiers in a conquered country than representatives of a foreign king at a friendly court. Louis, as has been stated, occupied Avignon, and, with a view to justifying his conduct in this and other matters, *appealed from the judgment of the Pope to that of a General Council.* In the meantime, the controversy on the subject of the *Regalia* was carried on with unabated earnestness. The appeals of the Bishops of *Pamiers* and *Alais* were favorably received by the Pope; and Louis called an assembly of the French Clergy, consisting of thirty-four archbishops and bishops, two agents of the clergy, and thirty-six priests, all of whom were in the interest of the king, and from whom he obtained the celebrated "Declaration" of 1682, containing the "*Four Articles*," which are regarded as the charter of the so-called "*Gallican Liberties.*" The Pope protested against the "Declaration," and the king commanded that its provisions be enforced throughout the whole of his dominions. The work was accomplished, and the evil done, and of its gravity there could be only one opinion. During

[1] Vita d'Innoc. XI., 1690, 4to; *Bonamici*, de Vita et rebus gestis Innocentis XI., Romae, 1776.

Hosted by Google

these troubles and conflicts the holiness of Innocent was such that the people esteemed him a saint; and, to comfort the closing days of his life, he learned that *John Sobieski* had gained a brilliant victory over the Turks before Vienna, and that the Gospel was being rapidly spread among the heathen. But the event which contributed perhaps as much as any other to gladden his heart was the arrival at Rome of a deputation, sent by a number of schismatical bishops, to convey to the Holy Father the profession of their submission to the Holy See.

The holy Innocent was succeeded by *Alexander VIII.* (Ottoboni, 1689–1691), who, being a native of Venice, very naturally rendered what help he could to the Republic in its struggle with the Turks. Although he had obtained from Louis XIV. the restoration of Avignon and Venaissin, he was not deterred from publishing a brief, in which he condemned the Four Articles of the Gallican Liberties. It was also during his pontificate that the valuable library of Christina, ex-Queen of Sweden, was added to that of the Vatican. The memory of Alexander has unfortunately suffered much from the misconduct of his nephews, to whom, on account of his advanced age, he allowed a large share in the government.

His successor, *Innocent XII.* (Pignatelli, 1691–1700), took Innocent XI. as his pattern and model in governing the Church. He published a bull, expressly forbidding nepotism; enacted useful and severe laws regarding the execution of justice and reformation of morals within the Papal States; and provided carefully for the poor, whom he called his nephews, putting the Lateran palace at their service as an hospital. After a long and by no means agreeable experience, Louis XIV. was forced to give the French bishops leave to write to the Pope, to state that they very much regretted the Declaration of 1682, and that they regarded it as invalid. The king himself had previously written to say "that it gave him great pleasure to be able to inform His Holiness that, in whatever related to the Declaration of the clergy, he had taken the necessary steps to render inoperative the ordinances of 1682, which he was driven to enact by force of circumstances." The Pope, in turn, confirmed the appointments

Hosted by Google

made to bishoprics during the continuance of the controversy. Possibly no official act of his pontificate caused Innocent more pain than the condemnation of the work of the noble Archbishop Fenelon, entitled "*Maxims of the Saints.*" Innocent died September 27, 1700, during the celebration of the centenary jubilee, which vast numbers of pilgrims, obedient to his call, were flocking to Rome to celebrate.

§ 363. *Popes of the Eighteenth Century.*

After some delay and hesitation, *Clement XI.* (Albani, 1700–1721), ascended the papal throne. A prince of the House of Albani, he was an accomplished scholar, a man of independent character, and an able and eloquent preacher.[1] From the very beginning of his reign he saw himself surrounded with difficulties of no ordinary kind. *Frederic I.* had lately (1700) accepted the title of *King of Prussia*; but as the Teutonic Order had once owned the Duchy of Prussia, and had never surrendered its claim, Pope Clement protested against the *royal* assumptions of Frederic; and the protest, which has been often renewed by his successors,[2] has been the occasion of much *affected surprise*, and no little misrepresentation, by the enemies of the Papacy. Contrary to his wish, Clement was also made a party to the disputes arising out of the War of Succession in Spain, which, following close upon the death of Charles II., he had done all in his power to prevent.

Joseph I., Emperor of Germany, believing that the Pope was disposed to look with favor upon the claims of France, and to oppose the recognition of his own brother as King of Spain, prepared to make him feel the full weight of his anger. His troops pillaged the States of the Church, and his generals concluded an alliance with the Dukes of Parma and Piacenza, for the purpose of laying the clergy under contribution. To

[1] Opp. Rom. 1722, Frcf. 1729, 2 T., f. *Buder*, The Life of Clement XI., Frkft. 1721, 3 vols. (Polidoro) Libb. VI. de vita et reb. gest. Clem. XI., Urb. 1724. *Reboulet*, Hist. de Clém. XI., Avign. 1752, 2 T., 4to.

[2] The Pope (Epp. et brevia selectiora, pp. 43 sq., ed. Frcf.) says: Fridericum marchionem Brandenburgensem nomen et insignia regis Prussiae inaudito forte hactenus apud Christianos more nec sine gravi antiqui juris, *quod ea provincia sacro et militari Teutonicorum ordini competit*, violatione sibi publice arrogasse.

Hosted by Google

the already existing troubles of the Pope another was added, viz., the controversy on the *right of presentation* to cathedral churches and religious foundations. The Pope threatened excommunication, and began to prepare for war; but at the approach of the imperial troops he was forced to make peace; to lay aside his arms; to recognize Charles III. as King of Spain; and to grant him the investiture of the kingdom of Naples.

When *Philip V. of Anjou* learned the conditions of this treaty he was so incensed that he ordered the Papal Nuncio to quit Spain, and forbade all intercourse between his subjects and the Holy See.

Finally, Clement was drawn into another controversy with Victor Amadeus of Savoy, in 1711, contrary to whose will he had published sentence of excommunication against certain magistrates of that country for their contemptuous disregard of the rights of the Church. But there was a still more serious cause of complaint against Amadeus. Having ascended the throne of Sicily in virtue of the stipulations of the Peace of Utrecht (1713), this prince proceeded, without the Pope's consent, to arrogate to himself the ecclesiastical prerogatives of the "*Sicilian Monarchy*,"[1] which he well knew had always been denied to the Sicilian monarchs. Having placed the kingdom of Sicily under interdict, the Pope was under the necessity of supporting three thousand Sicilian ecclesiastics, who, fleeing from the country, sought refuge in Rome. Thus were the troubles of the Holy See daily increasing in number and gravity. The Pope was encouraged to maintain his firm and resolute attitude by *the memory of the great influence exercised in times past by the Holy See;* but, while not lacking in courage himself, he received but scant support from the Catholic sovereigns, who, like their Protestant neighbors, sought to take upon themselves the exercise of spiritual powers, and to use both religion and the Head of the Church only to further their selfish political aims. To remedy these evils, the Pope did what he could, but to no purpose; his protests were unheeded, and his voice fell upon ears that would not hear.

During the pontificate of *Innocent XIII.* (1721–1724) the

[1] See Vol. II., pp. 516 sq.

Hosted by Google

differences existing between the kingdom of Naples and the Holy See were terminated. In consideration of an annual tribute of six thousand ducats, transported to Rome on a white palfrey, the Pope consented to recognize the claim of Charles VI. to the title of king; although this condescension on the part of Innocent did not prevent the Emperor, in spite of protests, from transferring to Don Carlos the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which for two hundred years had been fiefs of the Holy See. By the premature death of Innocent, the Church lost a wise, prudent, and enlightened ruler, whose official life seems absolutely without fault, unless indeed the unfortunate elevation of the unworthy Abbé Dubois to a place in the College of Cardinals, a mistake that might happen to any one, be regarded as such.

Benedict XIII. (Orsini, 1724–1730), after his election, begged with tears in his eyes not to be forced to accept the pontifical dignity;[1] and if he finally consented, he did so only because of the obedience which as a Dominican, he owed to the Superior of his Order. He dearly loved a cloistral life; his heart was in his convent, and he dreaded going out into the world. Shortly after his election he published various sumptuary regulations, restricting the luxurious habits of the cardinals, prescribing modesty of dress to the clergy, etc. A *council* convoked by him in the Lateran palace (1725) made many wise enactments for the suppression of scandals and abuses, and decreed that the bull *Unigenitus*, directed against the errors of *Quesnel*, should be received as a rule of faith throughout the Universal Church. Benedict recovered the town of *Comacchio*, which had been in the hands of the Emperor since 1708, and came to an understanding with Charles regarding the Sicilian monarchy, in virtue of which he granted to that monarch and his successors the right of appointing the so-called "*Judge of the Monarchy*," whom he invested with very ample powers, limiting his own jurisdiction *to matters of essential importance*. He also terminated the controversy between the Holy See and the Dukes of Sardinia and

[1] Opp. theol., Rom. 1728, 3 T. f. Icon et mentis et cordis Ben. XIII., Fref. 1723. *Alex. Borgia*, Ben. XIII. vita, Rom. 1752, 4to; his Life and Acts, Frkft. 1731.

Hosted by Google

Savoy, on the understanding that, while enjoying the right of patronage over the churches and convents within their States, they should not appropriate the revenues of vacant bishoprics, which were to be expended for the benefit of the churches. He was not so successful in maintaining friendly relations with Portugal, whose king, John V., in a rude and insolent letter, demanded that *Bicchi*, who had been Nuncio at Lisbon, and recently recalled, should be created a Cardinal. The College protested, and John, irritated at the refusal of the Pope to accede to his demand, ordered home the Portuguese then residing in Rome; interdicted all intercourse between his kingdom and the Holy See; and forbade the convents of Portugal to send their customary alms to Rome (1725).

The Feast of *St. Gregory VII.*, which had heretofore been celebrated only by the Benedictine Order and the Chapter of Salerno, was now extended to the Universal Church, and, strange to say, was the occasion of no little trouble to the Pontiff. The governments of Venice, France, and Austria affected great displeasure, in that mention had been made in the lessons of the Office of the excommunication and deposition of the Emperor Henry IV.

Benedict was also unfortunate in taking into his confidence Cardinal Coscia, by whose simulated piety he was deceived, and by whose abuse of power and influence the Church was dishonored and he himself enriched.

Clement XII. (Corsini, 1730–1740), at the close of a distinguished career, and when far advanced in age, was raised to the papal throne, and while there did much to promote justice and advance the arts and sciences. He was the founder of the Museum of Roman Antiquities, and sent the learned *Assemani* to the East in search of manuscripts, of which they procured a number of very valuable ones. He ended the difficulty with Portugal by creating Bicchi a cardinal; but was almost immediately involved in fresh complications with Spain. "It would seem that since the opening of the century the princes of Europe had made up their minds that, instead of the respectful deference with which the Holy See had been treated in time past, they would exhibit toward it only insolent rudeness and arbitrary self-will." So notorious was

Hosted by Google

their conduct in this respect, that even the Protestant princes, in their intercourse with the Head of the Catholic Church, treated him with more consideration than the Catholics themselves. On the death of the Duke Anthony, in 1731, the Pope made a fresh attempt to recover the Duchy of Parma, but was not more successful than his predecessors had been. To aid in the conversion of the Greeks, he founded a school of theology at *Bissignano*, in Calabria (*Seminarium Corsini*); and, by a bull of the year 1738, he condemned the order of *Freemasons*, and the condemnation was renewed in 1751 by Benedict XIV.

After the death of Clement XII., the cardinals went into conclave, and, at the expiration of six months, finally agreed upon Cardinal Lambertini, who as Pope took the name of *Benedict XIV.* (1740–1758). He was one of the *most learned* men that ever filled the papal throne. He at once applied himself to restore the finances from the disordered condition into which they had fallen, owing to the extravagance into which *Benedict XIII.* had been driven by Cardinal Coscia, and the enormous sums expended by Clement XII. on public buildings. To effect this he encouraged agriculture, promoted the manufacturing interests, and discountenanced all sorts of extravagance and luxury.[1] He published wise ordinances for the amelioration of the clergy, some of which were favorable to the Dominicans and adverse to the Jesuits; abolished certain *holy days* of obligation, or rather reduced their number, in those States in which it was represented there were too many (1748); and, by his moderation, prudently discriminating between claims that must be maintained and those that might be surrendered, re-established friendly relations between the Holy See and the different Courts of Europe. In the year 1740 he granted to John V. of Portugal the right of appointing to all bishoprics and prebends falling vacant within

[1] *Bened. XIV.*, Opp. ed. *Azevedo*, Rom. 1747–1751, 12 vols., f.; his bulls (Bullar. M., Luxemb. 1754, T. XVII.–XIX.), and acta hist. eccl., Vol. I., p. 144 sq.; Vol. IV., p. 1058 sq.; Vol. XV., p. 907 sq., 637 sq. Cf. *Guarnacci*, l. c., p. 942; T. II., p. 487 sq. Vie du Pape Bénéd. XIV., Par. 1783, 12mo. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 31, p. 153–177.

Hosted by Google

his kingdom, and eight years later conferred upon him the title of "*Most Faithful*" (*Rex fidelissimus*).

Conjointly with the King of Naples he established in that city a tribunal, consisting of an equal number of clerical and lay members, and presided over by an ecclesiastic, before which all ecclesiastical causes were to be brought for adjudication.[1] In 1753 he concluded a Concordat with Spain, by which, while reserving to the Holy See the right of appointment to fifty-two of the more considerable benefices, he surrendered his claims to the exercise of similar jurisdiction over the lesser ones, in consideration of the payment of a large indemnity.[2] A similar compromise was made in the case of Sardinia. He also attempted to compromise the dispute pending between Austria and the Republic of Venice concerning the patriarchate of Aquileia, deciding that the patriarchal rights should be divided between the Archbishopric of Goerz, in Austria, and that of Udine, in the States of Venice (1751). The decision, however, was unfavorably received by the Republic, which, in consequence, published an ordinance (1754) forbidding any bull, brief, or summons from the Holy See to be made public until after it had been submitted to the supervision and received the sanction of the government. This was the only important question remaining unsettled at the time of Benedict's death. In many public documents, Benedict gave the *title of king* to the ruler of Prussia. He conferred many favors on the *Society of Nobles* (*Societas nobilium*), an association formed in Hungary for the defense and propagation of the Catholic religion. As has been stated, he renewed the condemnation of the Freemasons, published by Clement XII., because all wise and good Christians were of opinion that the aims of that body were wicked and its methods evil. Finally, he has left behind him as monuments of his profound erudition and the wide range of his learning, not alone numerous and important works, which place him in the front rank among the scholars and writers of that age, but also societies founded by him to promote the study of

[1] *Mosheim*, Ch. H.; Germ. by *Schlegel*, Vol V., p. 666.

[2] *Schroeckh*, Ch. H. since the Reformation, Vol. VI., p. 447.

Hosted by Google

Roman and Christian Antiquities and *Canon Law*, which have since become famous, adding no little luster to his name. Though of easy manners and amiable disposition, charming all who approached him, his brilliant wit and caustic speeches at times were a source of annoyance to over-sensitive persons.

His successor, *Clement XIII.* (Rezzonico, 1758–1769), as Bishop of Padua, enjoyed a high reputation for sanctity, but being an avowed friend of the Jesuits, he was, from the very opening of his pontificate, involved in ceaseless contentions with the various courts of Europe, notably with the Bourbon kings of France, Spain, and Naples.[1] It gave him great pain which was still more intensified by the consciousness of his inability to relieve the sufferers, to learn that *Pombal*, the Portuguese Minister of State, and *Pereira*, the canonist of the Court, were pursuing the Jesuits with all manner of persecution, heaping calumnies upon them, and meditating their expulsion from the kingdom (1559). In the following year his own Nuncio was obliged to quit the country, being conducted under escort across the frontier. In spite of their complete vindication by the bishops, and the Pope's energetic protests, the Jesuits were suppressed in France in 1764, in Spain in 1767, and in Naples in 1768.

His method of dealing with the *Duke of Parma* was very different. This prince had published a statute of *mortmain*, specially directed against the clergy, and had otherwise limited their immunities and prerogatives. In this case Clement took high ground, informing the usurper that he spoke to him not only as Pope, but also as one exercising the right of suzerainty over the Duchy. The French and Neapolitan branches of the Bourbons espoused the cause of the Duke; demanded the withdrawal of the pontifical brief; and seized the estates of the Church, the former taking possession of Avignon and Venaissin, and the latter of Benevento. They were all the more committed to this course, when, instead of yielding, the Pope resisted with firmness and dignity; renewed the confirmation of the Society of Jesus; and invoked the aid of *Maria Teresa*, to whom and her successors, as sov-

[1] *Bower-Rambach*, Vol. X., sect. II., pp. 381 sq.

Hosted by Google

ereigns of Hungary, he gave the title of "*Apostolic Majesty*" (*Rex Apostolicus*). To his appeal she replied "that the affairs of which he spoke being of a political and not religious character, she could not rightfully interfere."

It would almost seem that the sovereigns of Europe had conspired together to avenge the real or imaginary wrongs which they had at any time suffered or fancied they had suffered at the hands of the papacy; and that the Holy See, after having successfully resisted the violent assaults of Protestant princes during the preceding period, was fated to go down under the blows of *Catholic princes* in the present one. And so violent did this spirit of outrage become, that even the petty *Republic of Genoa* demanded of the Roman Court a tax of six thousand scudi for the mere privilege of allowing the papal envoy to Corsica to enter its territory.

In the beginning of the year 1769, the envoys of the various Bourbon Courts demanded that the Pope should unconditionally abolish the Society of Jesus, and the demand so agitated the Holy Father that he did not live to attend a consistory which he had called for the 3d of February, to consider the matter, having died the day previous, without being at all confined to his bed.

Cardinal *Ganganelli*, of the Order of St. Francis, was unanimously elected May 14, 1769, by the cardinals in the interest of the civil powers, and on ascending the papal throne took the name of *Clement XIV.* (1769–1774). He at once set about reconciling the Bourbon princes to the Holy See.[1] He began by adjusting the difficulties with Parma, after which he raised the brother of Pombal, Minister to Portugal, to the dignity of the cardinalate, and confirmed the appointment of *Pereira* to the bishopric of Coimbra. The practice of annually reading the bull "*In Coena Domini*" being offensive to many

[1] La Vie du Pape Clém. XIV. par le Marq. de *Carraccioli*, Par. 1775; Germ., Frkft. 1776. Lettres intéres-santes du P. Clém. XIV., trad. du lat. et de l'ital. par *Carraccioli*, Par. 1776 sq., 3 T., and frequently in Italian and German (suppositious in several passages). Life of Pope Clement XIV., Berlin and Lps. 1774, 1775, 3 vols. *Walch*, Modern Hist. of Religion, Pt. I., p. 3–54, 201–248. *Reumont*, Ganganelli, Pope Clement XIV.: His Letters and His Age, Berlin, 1847. *Theiner*, Hist. of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., Lps. 1853, 2 vols. By the *same*, Clementis XIV. epistolae et brevia, Paris, 1853.

Hosted by Google

princes, the Pope abolished it *forever*, and immediately after Avignon, Venaissin, and Benevento were restored to the Holy See, and Portugal consented to again receive a Papal Nuncio. Still it was not all fair sailing with Clement, who found himself obliged to resist the arbitrary proceedings of Spain, Naples, and Venice, concerning the disposal of church property. He also endeavored to counteract the growing influence of *Febronianism* in Germany, and sent words of encouragement to the Poles, with whose political and religious troubles he deeply sympathized. But what gave him the greatest pain and anxiety was the peremptory demand made by the Bourbon Courts for the suppression of the Jesuits. Unfortunately, during the first year of his pontificate, he had given his word to the governments of Spain (September 30, 1769) and France (November 30) that, being fully convinced that the Society of Jesus no longer accomplished for the Church the special work contemplated by its founders, he would of his own free will, and without external constraint or influence, order its suppression, which he did by the *brief Dominus ac Redemptor*, bearing date of July 21, 1773, of which there will be again occasion to speak further on.[1] There was a suspicion that he had died of poison, but that it was without foundation is shown by the sworn declaration of *Marzoni*, a member of the Order of Franciscan Conventuals, and by the statement of the attending physicians.

Pius VI. (Angelo Braschi, 1774–1799), ascending the papal throne at a season full of political and religious difficulties,[2] and fully alive to the critical condition of affairs, said prophetically to the cardinals after his election: "*Your pleasure is my misfortune.*" The early part of Pius' reign is marked by the foundation of the *Pio-Clementine Museum*, containing some of the noblest art-treasures in the world; and by the drainage of the *Pontine Marsh*, undertaken and prosecuted without any regard to cost. Shortly after the death of Maria Teresa (1780), her son, *Joseph II.*, threw himself into the ranks, or

[1] *Leo*, Text-Book of Universal History, Vol. IV., pp. 476 sq.

[2] *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., pp. 60 sq. *Walch*, Mod. Hist. of Rel., Pt. V., pp. 257 sq. Hist. of Pius VI. (Vienna), 1799.

Hosted by Google

rather placed himself at the head of those whose one aim was to bring into discredit the authority of the Holy See. To secularize and abolish Religious Orders, to spoil the property of the Church, to fill episcopal sees without the authorization of the Pope, to deprive papal nunciatures of their spiritual jurisdiction, to separate churches from the Center of Unity and make them national, and to do all this under pretext of introducing useful and necessary reforms appears to have been the aim of his life and the scope of his ambition.[1] Most of the governments of Europe, in their relations to the Church and her Head, carried into practical effect the principles of Voltaire, then rapidly gaining ground in France, and of which they themselves were soon to become the victims. Joseph II. enacted that all papal bulls and episcopal ordinances should receive the imperial *placet* before publication; remodeled the oath to be taken by bishops; abrogated the *reservation* of benefices to the Pope; forbade any one to accept, without his consent, titles or dignities bestowed by the Holy See; prohibited all intercourse between the convents of his empire and those of the same Order in other countries; placed monastic houses under the jurisdiction of the ordinary of the dioceses in which they were situated; exempted Religious Orders from obedience to their respective Generals resident in Rome; and suppressed many monasteries of men and all convents of women, except those of the Ursulines and Salesians, which were spared to carry on the work of education, but their number was nevertheless considerably reduced.[2] The suppressed monasteries and convents were turned into hospitals, universities, barracks, and military magazines, and their confiscated revenues employed in establishing four hundred new parishes "for the more easy access to public worship," and in endowing the same, forty millions of florins being set apart and deposited in the treasury for this purpose. This "*Religious Fund*" gradually melted away till only one-

[1] Consult on the subject the recent works by *Arneth*, *Brunner*, *Ritter*, and *Wolf*, quoted below, at the head of § 370.

[2] In 1780, there were in the Austrian dominions 2,024 convents, and 63,000 monks and nuns. The former were reduced to 1,300, and the latter to 27,000. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

half the original amount remained; and the "cameralistic domains," consisting of the confiscated real estate of the Religious Orders, was so mismanaged as to be wholly unproductive to the State. He attempted to reform some religious houses after his own fashion; and, while professing an ardent zeal to purify religion of what he was pleased to term superstitious practices, prohibited pilgrimages and processions, and abolished religious confraternities.

For the instruction of youth in their religious duties a politico-moral catechism was published, and, by imperial order, introduced into all schools. Diocesan seminaries were suppressed, and their place supplied by others of a more general character; and all candidates for Holy Orders were required to pass through an examination of unusual severity.

At the *Congress of Ems*, in 1786, the Archbishops of Mentz, Treves, Cologne, and Salzburg attempted to give some sort of ecclesiastical sanction to these imperial measures. Joseph's example was closely copied by his brother *Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany*, who in turn received sympathy and encouragement from *Scipio Ricci*, Bishop of Pistoja; by the *Republic of Venice;* and by *Tanucci*, the *Neapolitan* minister.[1] The *Spanish Court*, too, was highly incensed against the Holy See because of its refusal to place Bishop Palafox, the determined enemy of the Jesuits, upon the catalogue of the Saints; while in both Italy and Germany an animated discussion was taking place on the question of clerical celibacy.[2]

To avert the dangers which, originating with the government of Austria, though not sanctioned by the faithful people of that country, seriously threatened the Holy See, Pius VI. determined to go in person to Vienna, in the hope that, by the influence of his presence and the authority of his apostolical office, he might obtain the repeal of laws so hostile to the Church and so destructive of the best interests of the State. His journey was one uninterrupted triumph. The inhabitants of the cities and towns through which he passed came out as one man to greet him, and kneeling begged his blessing. In

[1] Cf. *Walch*, Ch. H., Pt. V., pp. 2–218.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. II., pp. 437 sq.

Hosted by Google

this universal expression of joy at having the Head of the Church in their midst, there were but two who did not share—two whose conduct plainly showed that the presence of the Holy Father was irksome to them—and these were the Emperor and his arrogant old minister, *Kaunitz*. The Emperor declined to assist at the Pontifical Office; forbade his subjects to even speak to the Pope without special leave from him; and, to prevent any secret access to his person, walled up all the doors of his lodgings except one, which was strongly guarded. To a request from Pius for a conference on affairs of State, the Emperor replied that he had no knowledge of public business, which he left entirely to the members of his council, to whom the Pope might submit his views in writing. In his intercourse with the Holy Father, Kaunitz was uniformly and studiously vulgar. He would rudely shake the extended hand of the Holy Father, instead of kissing it, as Catholic usage and ordinary courtesy require; he abstained from visiting the Pontiff; and when the latter, under pretense of going through his gallery of paintings, sought an interview, the minister received him in a light morning-gown. After a fruitless stay of four weeks, during which he accomplished no more than the obtaining of a simple promise that nothing should be done prejudicial to either the doctrines of the Church or the dignity of her Head, he quitted the city, and set out for Rome. But the impression which his presence and dignified bearing had left upon the minds of both clergy and people was deep and enduring; and the scurrilous pamphlets, which the canonist, *Valentine Eybel*, and others equally infamous, published against him, were powerless to counteract its beneficial effects. The Emperor accompanied his august visitor as far as Mariabrunn, where he took leave of him; and a few hours later, as if to show to the world that the Pope had produced no change in his sentiments, ordered a convent established in that locality to be suppressed.[1] These

[1] Joseph II., writing to Catharine of Russia, who had expressed some anxiety on account of the presence of Pius VI. in Vienna, said: "In reality, the Pope has accomplished nothing. He was even obliged to draw up in my favor a written document, expressing his satisfaction with the condition in which he

Hosted by Google

assaults against the papal power culminated in the French Revolution, of which Pius was the most illustrious victim. After 1789, all the ecclesiastical estates in France were declared national property; but the details of the events of these memorable years belong to the *second half* of the present Epoch.

§ 364. *The Gallican Church—Gallican Liberties.*

(*Picot*), Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France pendant le XVIIe siècle, Paris, 1824, 2 vols.; German, by *Raess* and *Weis*, Frkft. 1829, 2 vols. *Ranke*, Hist. of France during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Vols. III. and IV. (Complete Works, Vols. X.–XIII.)

During the latter half of the preceding Epoch the Church of France had been at once more active and more agitated than that of any other country; and on this account she is before the world more conspicuously than any other during the interval of time of which we are now about to treat, when events that had been long preparing were producing their legitimate consequences.

Louis XIV. had employed systematic violence and crafty political methods against the Church, but more directly against her Head.[1] He seemed to think that by using arbitrary measures to crush the already enfeebled power of the Pope he could the more effectually exalt his own. In speaking of the pontificate of Innocent XI., we noticed the pretensions of the French king concerning the *Right of Regalia*. The celebrated *Declaration* of the French clergy in the *Four Articles* of 1682, said to have been drawn up by *Bossuet*,[2] was the outcome of this controversy between the Pope and the king. These articles declare:

found my own religion and that of my subjects." (*Von Arneth*, The Correspondence of Joseph II. with Catharine of Russia, Vienna, 1869.)

[1] *Lacretelle*, Histoire de France au XVIIIe siècle. (Germ. by *Sander*, Brl. 1810, 2 vols.)

[2] Printed in *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., pp. 127, 128. *Litta* (Cardinal), Lettres sur les soi-disant quatre articles du clergé de France, avec une introduction par Martin de Noirlieu; tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ., by *Robiano* (with preface), Münster, 1844. **Phillips*, C. L., Vol. III., p. 339–365.

Hosted by Google

I. That to St. Peter and to his successors, and even to the Church herself, God gave power only in things spiritual and pertaining to everlasting life; but not in things civil or temporal; for He said: "My kingdom is not of this world;" and again: "Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;" and hence the truth of this saying of the apostles: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers, for there is no power but from God, and those that are are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." Hence, in temporal concerns, kings and rulers are, *by ordinance of God*, subject to no power of the Church; neither can they be deposed, either directly or indirectly, by the authority of the Keys, nor can their subjects be freed from their allegiance, their obedience, and their sworn promise of fidelity. That this teaching, inasmuch as it is necessary to the preservation of the public peace, beneficial alike to Church and State, and in harmony with the word of God, the tradition of the Fathers, and the examples of the Saints, should by no means be given up.

II. That the fullness of Spiritual power possessed by the Apostolic See and by the Successors of St. Peter, the Vicars of Jesus Christ, is such that it does not invalidate or destroy the force of the Decrees contained in the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Holy Ecumenical Synod of Constance "*On the Authority of General Councils*," which were approved by the Apostolic See, confirmed by the usage of the whole Church and of the Roman Pontiffs themselves, and at all times maintained by the Gallican Church; and that the Gallican Church does not agree with those who weaken the force of these Decrees by claiming that they are of doubtful authority and wanting in approbation, or who restrict their application to a period of schism, such as existed at the time of the Council.

III. That, therefore, the use of the Apostolic power is to be restricted by the Canons, enacted by the Spirit of God, and made sacred by reverence of the whole world; that the rules, customs, and institutions of the Gallican Kingdom and Church continue in full force; that the bounds set up by the Fathers remain inviolate; and that the Holy See owes it to its own dignity to see that the statutes and customs established by this same See, and confirmed by the consent of the churches, shall, as is becoming, subsist unchanged.

IV. That, while in questions of faith the Supreme Pontiff has the chief part, and his decrees are binding upon each and every church, his judgment is not irreversible (*irréformable*), unless it shall have been confirmed by the consent of the Church.

Besides these Four articles, usually called the "*Liberties* of the Gallican Church," but more appropriately the "*Slaveries*," certain other claims were made, as, for instance, the *Appellatio tanquam ab abusu*, *placetum regium*, etc. The great blunder committed by this Gallican Assembly was the making of "*general theorems*, which were more or less at variance with the practice of the Church, and whose discussion ought to have been confined to the Schools, the *matter of conciliar*

Hosted by Google

enactments, when there was no sufficient cause for so doing; thus giving the civil power an excuse for enforcing them and making them part of the fundamental law of the State." The French Bishops turned a deaf ear to the voice of *Fenelon*, who warned them that "it was from the *Civil* Power, and not from Rome, that encroachments and usurpations were in the future to come; that in matter of fact the king was now more Head of the Gallican Church than the Pope himself; that the king's authority had been transferred to secular judges; and that bishops were now ruled by *laymen*." The French Bishops closed their eyes to the uniform teaching of historical precedents, which proved indisputably that every church separating itself from the spiritual Head of the Hierarchy had of necessity gone to ruin. However, it is not necessary to question here the motives by which the author of the "Declaration" and his party were inspired.

Bossuet, writing to an intimate friend, gives this explanation of his conduct. "I had always thought," he said, "that it would be well to so explain the authority of the Holy See, that while compromising none of its sacred rights, those who fear rather than love it, and even heretics and all its adversaries, might be brought to regard it with sentiments of tender respect. The Holy See has lost absolutely nothing by the Declaration of France, for the Ultramontanes themselves allow that in the instance in which France sets a Council above the Pope, he might be proceeded against in another way, as, for example, by declaring that he had forfeited the Papacy. Hence, it is not so much the thing itself that is in question as the way in which it is to be done." Taking this fallacious principle as the basis of his argument, Bossuet wrote a "Defense of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy," upon which he was engaged for thirty years of his life, and which was indiscreetly published five-and-twenty years after his death.

It is nevertheless evident both from the peculiar way in which these Articles were drawn up, and from the application made of them by numerous ecclesiastics, and particularly by the parliaments, that they did contain the germ of *schismatical tendencies*, inasmuch as they were pressed into service when-

Hosted by Google

ever a stand was to be made against the Holy Apostolic See, or whenever it was thought expedient to refuse obedience to its decrees. They were also dangerous, in that they flattered the vanity of the "great nation" *by holding France up to the admiration of the world as the land of ecclesiastical freedom, and the Gallican Church as the true Catholic model for all other churches.*

The leading spirits of the so-called *reformatory synods* seemed to forget that ever since the days of *St. Irenaeus* the Gallican Church had esteemed it a privilege and a glory to defend the rights of the Holy See. The more far-seeing of the French Bishops, with Fenelon at their head, rightly judged that these supposed "Liberties" would in the long run prove to be, what the event verified, so many "*Slaveries.*" This has been but recently admitted by *Pressensé*, a Protestant writer. "Gallicanism," he says, "made the Church the handmaid of the State; and its famous *Liberties* were but liberties taken by the *King* to govern in both the ecclesiastical and civil domains."[1] The Articles of the Declaration of 1682 have been very fairly discussed by *Thomassin*, the Oratorian;[2] and still more recently and no less fairly by *Walter* and *Charles Gérin*.[3]

§ 365. *Jansenism—Quesnel—Schism of Utrecht.*

Leydecker, Historiae Jansenismi, libb. VI., Traj. ad Rhen. 1695. *Luchesini*, Hist. polem. Jans., Rom. 1711, 3 T. Abrégé hist. des détours et des variat. du Jans. (place?), 1739, 4to. †*Thom. du Fossé*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Port-Royal, Col. 1739. *Nicole Fontaine*, under the same title, Colog. (Utrecht) 1738. (*Dom. de Colonia*, Jesuit), Dictionnaire des livres qui favorisent le Jan-

[1] *Bossuet*, Defensio declarationis Cleri Gallicani, Luxemb. (Gen.) 1730 (Oeuvres., nouv. éd. Par. 1836, 4 T., IX.); *du Pin*, De pot. eccl. et temp. s. declaratio cleri gallic., Vind. 1776, 4to; Mog. 1788, 4to. *Fénélon*, De summi Pontificis auctoritate diss. (oeuvres. nouv. éd. Par. 1838, T. I.); his sentiment, given above, is found in ch. 45. *Koehler*, Hist. Exposition of the Declaration drawn up by the Gallican Clergy, Hadamar and Coblenz, 1815. Cf. *The Catholic*, The Gallican Liberties and French Learning; three articles of the year 1865, Vol. I. *Pressensé*, Le Concile du Vatican, son histoire, etc.

[2] In his celebrated work, De nova et antiqua Eccles. disciplina, etc.; see Vol. I., p. 8, note 4.

[3] *Walter*, Canon Law, 13th ed., § 114, p. 270–273. *Chas. Gérin*, Recherches historiques sur l'assemblée du clergé de France de 1682, 2ème ed., Paris, 1870. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

sénisme, Antv. 1756, 4 T. *Reuchlin*, Hist. of Port-Royal, Hamburg, 1839 sq., 2 vols. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Journal of Theology, Vol. II., pp. 148–190; also "*Port-Royal* and Jansenism" (*Würzburg* Friend of Religion, 1845, April, nros. 26–28).

A controversy still more disastrous, both in its influence upon the people and in its general consequences, was that on Jansenism. Its origin has been already noticed.[1] After the five propositions of the "*Augustinus*" of Jansenius had been condemned, his partisans raised the questions:[2] "Is the Church really infallible in determining a question of *fact;* for example, the sense of a book? Is not her infallibility restricted to dogmatic truth?" Hence arose *the famous distinction of fact and right;* and it was said, in point of *right*, the five propositions were justly condemned, but in point of *fact* they were not contained in the book of Jansenius, at least in the *sense* in which they were condemned. The most eminent champions of Jansenism at this time were *Anthony Arnauld*,[3] *Nicole*, and the profound and celebrated *Pascal*,[4] all of whom were the avowed enemies of the Jesuits. The tactics of the Jansenists were very unlike those of Bajus, and in this consisted much of the insidious danger of Jansenism; for, while the latter addressed himself to a comparatively small number of learned and discriminating persons, the former aimed at influencing the masses, and for this purpose began at once to preach a doctrine of mysticism, which they held was the only *true theology* and *morality*, and contained the true *liberal* view of both ecclesiastical and political matters. Neither the method they adopted nor the teaching they propagated was

[1] Vide supra, § 351, pp. 428 sq.

[2] (*Du-Mas*), Hist. des cinq propos. de Jans.; see pag. 429, note 1. *Robbe*, Dissert. de Jansenismo (tractatus de gratia, T. II.), Par. 1780.

[3] Oeuvres complètes d'Arnaud, Lausanne, 1775–1783, 48 vols., 4to.

[4] Lettres provinciales, Paris, 1656, 12mo, and frequently; Lemgo, 1774, 3 vols. La Vie de Pascal, par sa soeur Mme. *Périer* and *Bossut* (not Bossuet), Discours sur la vie et les ouvrages de Pascal (Oeuvres de Pascal, 1670, 1779, 1819, also *Bossut*, Hist. des Mathématiques; tr. into Germ. by *Reiner*, Hamburg, 1804, Vol. II.) Pensées, fragments et lettres publiées par *P. Faugère*, Paris, 1844, 2 vols. (This edition gives the Pensées in their original shape.) *Herman Reuchlin*, Pascal, His Life and the Spirit of His Writings, Stuttg. 1840 (is partial). *Neander*, On the Historical Importance of the *Pensées* of Pascal, Berlin, 1847. *Dreydorf*, The Life and Struggles of Pascal, Lps. 1870.

Hosted by Google

wholly new; they had both been mapped out with sufficient accuracy and clearness in the Introduction to the *Second* Book of Jansenius' "*Augustinus.*" The Cistercian Convent of nuns of *Port-Royal-des-Champs*, near Versailles, a branch of which was established in Paris in 1638, and was known under the name of *Port-Royal-de-Paris*, was the great center of the Jansenistic movement. Its abbess was the famous *Angélique Arnauld*, the sister of the brothers Arnauld, and the pupil of the Abbot of St. Cyran. St. Francis de Sales, who had been her confessor, described her as a soul naturally vivacious, and constantly running into some extravagance. Fascinated by the new and mystical teachings of St. Cyran, she began to disseminate them among the other members of the convent, where they were calculated to do much harm, for the community had acquired a deservedly high reputation for strict observance of Rule and earnest piety. Having once put themselves in sympathy with the Jansenists, the nuns were encouraged to persevere in the course upon which they had entered, by the establishment at Port-Royal-des-Champs of an association of hermits, consisting of *Anthony Arnauld* and other well-known Port-Royalists, whose *penitential zeal was somewhat fantastic*, and who, acting on the counsels of St. Cyran, dissuaded from frequent Communion on the ground that a less frequent reception *would beget a habit of hungering for the Sacrament.*

To meet the subtle distinctions and wretched shifts by which the Jansenists sought to escape censure, Alexander VII. published the bull *Ad Sacram*, in which, besides confirming the bull *Cum occasione* of his predecessor, he stated specifically that the five propositions were in matter of fact contained in the *Augustinus* of Jansenius, and had been condemned in the sense in which they were there found. By the request of the French Bishops, the Pope sent at the same time a "*Formulary*," which all the clergy were required to subscribe without equivocation or reservation (1665). At the request of the Archbishop of Paris, *Bossuet* wrote to the inmates of Port-Royal, stating clearly the point at issue, and recommending obedience. "In all these formulas of faith," he wrote substantially, "in which the authority of the Church is

Hosted by Google

brought face to face with *facts*, it has never been found necessary to employ this distinction. The Church has often been required to examine and decide upon facts; as, for example, has such a bishop taught such an error? or is such an error found in such a book? Shorn of this right, it would be impossible for her to defend herself against false teaching. There is no instance in which the Church has waited until heresiarchs and their partisans have been pleased to come forward and confess themselves the authors of the errors with which they were charged. To how many and how great dangers would she not lay herself open should she suspend the effect of her decisions upon heretics and their works until the truth of the alleged facts would be candidly avowed by the heretics themselves?" *Fenelon* expressed himself in a similar sense some time later.[1] Recognizing the wisdom of the advice given by men so eminent, the bishops of the opposition consented, during the pontificate of Clement IX., to subscribe the *Formulary*, not indeed unreservedly and with full assent, but in the sense of what was called *respectful silence*, or, that while not believing they would remain quiet.

At the opening of the eighteenth century the controversy grew more spirited and acrimonious. In the year 1702, while the clergy were coming forward freely to sign the Formulary, the celebrated *Case of Conscience* made its appearance. In this an ecclesiastic, who had not been able to bring himself to believe that the Pope was infallible in deciding questions of *fact*, and had set his name to the Formulary with a corresponding mental restriction, was supposed to be in a dying condition and greatly troubled in his conscience. The confessor can not see his way clear, and puts the question: Can this man be absolved? Nearly all the Doctors of the Sorbonne, besides many others, held that he could. Cardinal Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, commanded them to retract the opinion, which most of them did, but others refused to do. Hereupon Clement XI. published (1705) his bull, *Vineam Domini*, in which, while reaffirming the teaching set forth in that of

[1] Correspondance de Fénélon, Paris, 1827, 3 T. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. V., p. 489 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 12, art. Jansénius, and Jansénisme.

Hosted by Google

Alexander VII., he declared that the "*respectful silence*" was not sufficient for absolution in the instance given in the *Case of Conscience*, and that it was necessary to put aside all doubt as to the Pope's infallibility in deciding questions involving dogmatic facts. The bull was accepted by both the clergy and parliament. The *Port-Royalists* of the convent near Versailles dearly atoned for their course in qualifying the acceptance of the Formulary and in resisting all appeals to return to Catholic obedience. In 1709 the convent was suppressed, the nuns distributed among the other Orders throughout France, and in 1710, by order of the king, the building itself was *demolished*,[1] an extreme measure, which many traced to the influence of Father *Le Tellier*, a Jesuit, and the king's confessor.

Strange to say, the controversy had not yet reached its full stature, to which, however, it was now brought by *Quesnel*, a French Oratorian. The scientific labors of Quesnel, and particularly his edition of the works of Leo the Great, preceded by some learned dissertations of his own, had fairly entitled him to the gratitude of all Catholics. Among the Oratorians the very salutary custom prevails of meditating daily upon certain passages of Holy Writ; and Quesnel, who had been very assiduous in this holy exercise, published, between the years 1671 and 1687, his *Moral Reflections* on the whole of the New Testament.[2] A deep religious spirit, devotional warmth and earnestness, and great power and grasp of thought pervaded the work throughout. It produced a marked influence, and was constantly to be seen in the hands of devout Christians. Cardinal Noailles, then Bishop of Châlons, gave it his approbation, and commended it to the faithful in a Pastoral, published in 1685. Other prelates followed his example, and Clement XI. himself expressed the belief that there was probably not an ecclesiastic in Italy capable of producing such a work. When, however, some of the most learned men in France, after a close and conscientious examination of the

[1] Mémoires sur la destruction de Port-Roy. des Champs, 1711. *Sainte-Beuve*, Port-Royal, Paris, 1840 sq., 2 T., of which a second edition (very spiteful) appeared.

[2] Le Nouv. Testam. en françois avec des réflexions morales, Par. 1687, and frequently. *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 245–322.

Hosted by Google

edition of the *Moral Reflections* issued in the year 1693, expressed their disapproval of the work on the ground that it contained Jansenistic errors, Clement appointed a commission, composed, not of Jesuits, the avowed enemies of the Jansenists, but of Dominicans, whose opinions on the points under consideration differed widely from those of the disciples of Ignatius, and charged this body to look carefully through the book, and report their judgment to him. After long and careful consideration, the Pope published the bull *Unigenitus* (1713), condemning one hundred and one propositions contained in the Moral Reflections.[1] It may be urged that the fact that the scope of Quesnel's book was to treat of pious meditation, of aspirations and forms of prayer, and not of dogmatic distinctions, stated with scientific accuracy, was not sufficiently taken into account. But it may be answered that in religious meditations, the aim of which is to foster a spirit of piety, we have a right to expect that the dogmatic propositions that underlie them, and upon which they are built, shall be luminous and established beyond all manner of doubt. This was all the more true in Quesnel's case, because having, after the death of Arnauld, become the recognized leader of the Jansenists (1694), he reproduced precisely all their errors on *free-will* and *grace*, teaching that grace is all-powerful and acts irresistibly, thus, like Jansenius, utterly destroying free-will. He concluded quite rigorously: "If God wishes to save the creature, saved he will infallibly be; and hence, if the creature be lost, it is because God would have it so."

Quesnel also gave expression to some *ideas on the Church* and her discipline, whose drift was, to say the least, *suspicious*,[2] maintaining, for example, that a person considering himself unjustly excommunicated was not cut off from holding friendly

[1] These propositions are, beside the Bullarium, found in Latin, also in the *Leipzig* stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, p. 283–291; in Latin and German in *Smets'* edition.

[2] *Huth*, Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 258 sq., and 279 sq. Cf. *Renati Jos. Dubois*, Collectio nova actor. publicor. constitut. Clementinae *Unigenitus*, Lugd. Batav. 1725. *C. M. Pfaff*, Acta publica const. *Unigenitus*, Tueb. 1728. Add to these: Errores et synopsis vitae Paschasii Quesnel, cujus 101 propositiones constitutione *Unigenitus* per Ecclesiam damnatae, etc.; accedunt instrumenta publicationum, etc., Antv. 1717, 12mo.

Hosted by Google

relations with God; for, though separated from the visible, he was not from the invisible body of the Church. He also held that all Christians, not excluding women and young children, should be allowed to read the Bible without any sort of restriction, else the children of light would be shut out from the very source of light.

But if Quesnel outraged the teaching of the Church, it must be frankly confessed that he was not the only participant in the controversy who did so. After the appearance of the bull *Unigenitus*, Cardinal Noailles, now *Archbishop of Paris* (from 1695 to 1729), forbade the Catholics of his diocese to read the Moral Reflections; but, strange to say, at an assembly of the French Clergy, convened by royal order in 1714, he objected to receiving the bull *Unigenitus* without qualification. Unable to get more than seven bishops of the assembly to side with him, he was defeated, but not silenced. He published a circular over his own name, in which, while again condemning the Moral Reflections, he forbade those within his jurisdiction, under penalty of suspension, to receive the dogmatic decisions of the Holy See on the same subject. When the question as to whether the bull should be registered by the Sorbonne was put to the vote, the affirmative decision was carried, but only by a simple majority.

With a view to allay popular feeling, daily growing more threatening, Louis XIV. conceived the design of convoking a national council, which his death in 1715 prevented him from carrying into effect. The worthless and immoral *Philip, Duke of Orleans*, held the regency during the minority of the young king, *Louis XV.*, when the Jansenists again rallied in all their force. Four bishops appealed from the bull *Unigenitus* to an Ecumenical Council. These were soon joined by one hundred and six doctors of the Sorbonne and by Cardinal Noailles, and, under the name of *Appellants*,[1] rapidly grew into a powerful and formidable party. These alarming indications of revolt against the authority of the Holy See decided

[1] The two parties went under the names of *Constitutionalists* and *Anti-Constitutionalists;* also of *Acceptants* and *Recusants*, according as they received or rejected the Papal *Constitution*. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

the Pope to publish (1718) the unusually severe bull *Pastoralis officii*, declaring that any one, be he cardinal or bishop, refusing to accept the constitution *Unigenitus* thereby ceased to be of the members of the Church. The Appellants protested, and Cardinal Noailles, who had been so peremptorily reminded of his duty, instead of obeying the Holy See, used the authority of his name and the influence of his family to strengthen the hands of its opponents. Thus, in 1720, while ostensibly promoting measures of peace, he was privately counseling resistance, a shifty policy, which he carried on until the year 1728, when he finally consented to receive the bull *Unigenitus*, without qualification or limitation, and his example was followed by the greater number of the *Appellant* bishops. The bishops of *Montpellier*, *Auxerre*, *Troyes*, *Senez*, *Metz*, *Mâcon*, *Tréguier*, *Pamiers*, and *Castres* alone held out, preferring exile to submission.

As is the case with all sects, the Jansenists now openly professed the most deplorable errors, lost all their former reserve and discretion, and sank in the estimation of the people. Their ascetical practices degenerated into fanaticism, and their unbelief was hardly distinguishable from atheism. Failing to regain public esteem by intrigue, they resorted to pretended miracles. Reports were widely circulated of numerous cures that were said to be daily taking place in the cemetery of St. Médard, at the tomb of the *deacon*, *Francis Pâris*, who in life had been a zealous *Appellant* († 1727).[1] To prove the sanctity of the deacon and the justness of his cause, a number of frenzied devotees would go into frantic convulsions and pretended ecstasies before the multitude. From having been extravagant they now became ridiculous; and this sect, which had so brilliant an opening, had, like every other, a farcical close, confirming once more the truth of the French proverb "*ridicule tue;*" and those who, as Voltaire said, buried Jansenism in the grave of the deacon Francis, expired as "*Convulsionaries.*" The cemetery was closed by royal

[1] Vie de M. François de Paris, Utr. 1729, and frequently. Relation des miracles de St. François de Par. avec un abrégé de sa vie, Brux. 1731. *Montgeron*, la Vérité des miracles du diacre Pâris, (Par. 1737) Col. 1845 sq., 3 T., 4to. *Mosheim*, Diss. ad h. e., T. II., p. 307 sq. *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Pt. I., p. 133–148.

Hosted by Google

order,[1] but the convulsions continued in private houses. At length *de Beaumont*, Archbishop of Paris (from 1746), prescribed strict rules for the guidance of his clergy in dealing with Jansenists, forbidding them to give the Sacraments to any one lying sick, who was not able to produce a certificate from his parish priest stating that he had been to confession. The measure was rendered necessary, because the *Appellants* were in the habit of going privately to their own confessors. The parliament took cognizance of the affair, citing the archbishop before its tribunal (1752). The prelate protested, denying the competency of the court; and the king, making the cause of the clergy his own, dissolved the parliament, and sent several of its members into exile. The pressure of circumstances obliged the king to recall them in 1754, when a violent reaction set in in favor of giving the Sacraments to the *Appellants*, and the archbishop refusing to yield, was in his turn banished from Paris. The controversy was still quietly and languidly proceeding, when *Clement XIV.*, taking the matter in hand, decided that the instructions of the archbishop should be rigorously carried out, but only in the case of those whose opposition to the bull *Unigenitus* was *notorious*. One of the saddest consequences of this conflict was the interference of the State in the affairs of the Church, thus setting up a precedent which gave color to the subsequent policy of the government.

The Jansenistic controversy was carried on with still more vehemence in the *Netherlands*, where it was productive of still more disastrous controversies, assuming there the character of an actual schism.[2] The metropolitan see of *Utrecht*, and the suffragan sees of Haarlem, Leeuwarden, Deventer, Groningen, and Middelburg, the latter all founded by King Philip II., had been abolished and their estates confiscated, in consequence of the religious and political troubles existing between

[1] Whereupon a wit wrote the following epigram:

De par le roi; défense à Dieu
De faire miracles en ce lieu. (Tr.)

[2] *Hoynk van Papendrecht*, Hist. de rebus eccl. Ultraject., Col. 1725. **Mozzi*, Storia delle revoluzioni della chiesa d'Utrecht, Ven. 1787, 3 vols. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 504 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 24, p. 422 sq.

Hosted by Google

Spain and the Netherlands;[1] but, in spite of these untoward circumstances, the number of Catholics still remaining and subject to the authority of the Vicar Apostolic was considerable. Gregory XIII. appointed *Sasbold Vismer*, Nuncio to Cologne, Vicar Apostolic, first of the diocese of Utrecht and subsequently of all the Low Countries. He was consecrated at Rome in 1602 by *Clement VIII.*, under the title of Archbishop of Philippi *in partibus infidelium*, and sent back to Utrecht with revocable jurisdiction. He was succeeded by *Philip Roven*, under the same title. This prelate did his best to preserve the Chapter of Utrecht, which was slowly losing its members, by establishing a kind of *collegiate* institution, composed of the dispersed parish-priests whom he had there gathered about him. Utrecht was then the chief asylum of the Jansenists, and there they continued to find protection and sympathy until the close of the seventeenth century, when the Vicar Apostolic, *Peter Kodde*, Archbishop of Sebaste (since 1688), openly avowed himself their friend. He was in consequence suspended from the exercise of his jurisdiction by Clement XI., and *Peter van Kock* (1702) appointed in his room under the name of Provicar. But neither the ministrations of van Kock nor those of his successors, *Daemen*, Bishop of Adrianople (from 1707), and *van Bylevelt*, were very effective, owing to the obstructions the Jansenists were constantly throwing in the way of their exercise. *Quesnel* himself withdrew to Amsterdam in 1703, where he continued to write in favor of Jansenism; and after his death, in 1719, Petitpied, Faulu, and others took his place, and kept up a constant intercourse with the Jansenists in France.

The Dutch government, whose interests were hostile to those of the Holy See, looked with favor upon, and at times actively promoted, the insidious plans of the Jansenists. Thus were the French Deacon *Boullenois* (1716) and *Dominic Varlet*, titular Bishop of Babylon, brought to Holland. Whatever of disorder was left undone was completed by the latter. Though suspended from the exercise of his functions, and acting in the face of a protest from Rome, he consecrated *Cornelius*

[1] See § 333.

Hosted by Google

Steenoven, who had been elected in 1723 by a *pretended chapter* of Utrecht, archbishop of that city. Varlet repeated the sacrilegious act several times after the death of Steenoven, and finally, in 1742, Archbishop *Meindarts* revived the bishoprics of Haarlem (1742) and Deventer (1752), thus preventing the extinction of the line of schismatical bishops. He held a synod in Utrecht in 1763, the acts of which he sent to Rome. Although many efforts have been made to close this schism, it endures to our own day, because the church of Utrecht stubbornly refuses to receive the bull *Unigenitus*. It, however, recognizes the primacy of the Holy See, and each bishop, when elected, notifies the Pope, professes submission to Rome, and requests to have his election confirmed. But the Popes have uniformly declined to receive any overtures, except on condition of the acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus*, and as a rule have declared the bishops-elect excommunicated.[1] The schismatics number about four thousand five hundred souls, scattered through twenty-five parishes in the dioceses of Utrecht and Haarlem. The Bishop of Deventer, who resides at Rotterdam, and has the title of Pastor of the Archdiocese of Utrecht, enjoys a sinecure, having no subjects. Such is the precarious existence which this Jansenist and Ultra-Gallican schism continues to drag out, though in possession of all the church property that had been rescued from the cupidity of the Reformers, and accumulated in later years by the economy of the Catholics.

§ 366. *Quietism—Molinos—Madame Guyon.*

Quietism in France (Tueb. Theolog. Quarterly, 1856, two articles).

While Jansenism was still occupying the thoughts of men, and unsettling their convictions, new errors, drawing life from the same source, engaged the attention of theologians. Originating like Jansenism, in the absence of a true spirit of interior life, they became notorious only after having encountered a lively opposition. The theologians of the Middle

[1] *Walch*, Modern Hist. of Religion, Pt. VI., p. 82 sq.; p. 165–174; p. 489–538. *Tueb. Quart.*, 1826, nro. 3, p. 178 sq.

Hosted by Google

Ages had not unfrequently made the body of religious teaching little more than an elaborate system of dry formulas and barren definitions, never treating morals except as the subject-matter of a repulsive casuistry. As was natural, the reaction against so cold and unsympathetic a system produced a false and fanatical enthusiasm that sometimes nearly unseated the reason. And what took place in the Middle Ages was repeated under analogous conditions in the seventeenth century. *Michael Molinos*, who was chiefly instrumental in setting this mystical reaction in motion, was born (1627) in the neighborhood of Saragossa, in Spain; that is to say, in the land where side by side with such marvels of true mysticism as St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, and Louis of Granada, there existed extravagant visionaries and fanatical antinomists. Molinos having completed his studies at Coimbra and Pampeluna, went in 1669 to reside in Rome, where persons of the highest rank and sincerest piety placed themselves under his spiritual direction. He shortly published a work entitled the *Spiritual Guide*, which for many years was very favorably received, and was translated from the original Spanish into both French and Italian.[1] The dangerous spirit that pervaded the book soon became manifest. Its most assiduous readers began to form little gatherings for themselves, to develop, together with a mystical, a pietistical tendency, and to use objectionable forms of prayer. The famous preacher, *Paul Segneri*, was the first to call public attention to the seductive errors it contained (*Concordantia laboris cum quiete in oratione*), and a more critical examination of its contents only confirmed the truth of his charges. Its author was in consequence pursued with rigorous severity until he had done penance and retracted his errors, which he did in 1687, when, though absolved, he was kept confined in a Dominican convent until his death, in 1696.

At the instance of Father la Chaise, confessor to Louis XIV., Innocent XI. condemned sixty-eight propositions con-

[1] *Guida spirituale*, Rom. 1681; in Spanish as early as 1675; in Latin by *Franke*, 1687; in German by *Arnold*, 1699. Recueil des div. pièces concernant le Quiétisme, Amst. 1688. Conf. *Weissmann*, H. e., Pt. II., p. 541. *Fretburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. VII., p. 213–218; Fr. tr., Vol. 15, p. 202 sq.

Hosted by Google

tained in Molinos' book. Although Cardinal Cibo, writing in the name of the Inquisition, had, as early as February 15, 1687, addressed a circular letter to all the prelates and princes of the Catholic Church, warning them against the dangerous and insidious character of Molinos' errors, the number of his partisans went on steadily increasing. They were known as *Quietists* and their errors as *Quietism*, because Molinos held that for one to be perfect the soul must be quiet, neither reasoning, sympathizing, nor exercising any faculty whatever, the most exalted state of the spiritual life being that in which one is wholly oblivious of self, yet wholly occupied with God. In order that the soul return to its principle and the source of its being, it must annihilate itself, be changed, transformed, and divinized. But to accomplish this the exercise of the mental faculties must cease, the soul must be passive, incapable of meditating or of even having a good thought of God Himself. Its sole function is to passively receive the infused light of Heaven, the accompaniment of a purely inactive state of contemplation.

In reply it was said that, according to this theory, the soul would be in such a state of absolute indifference that it would no longer give itself any concern about either Heaven or hell, or any of the dogmatic teachings of the Church; and that being thus lifted above the body by a supernatural union with God, it would forego the practice of the necessary works of charity, and in the end lapse into sensuality; for so completely would it be absorbed in God, that it would wholly disregard the functions of corporeal sense; and the criminal movements of the sensitive soul and the criminal actions of the bodily senses and members would therefore be entirely independent of it in this state of contemplative repose. Hence, from this sublime state of contemplation, in which all external things would be indifferent to the soul, there would be but one step to fatally lax principles in morals.

That these conclusions were fairly deducible from his system, Molinos could not deny. Moreover, Quietism, by identifying the Creator with the creature, or by what Molinos called *deification*, through a true and perfect annihilation of self, led directly to pantheism.

Hosted by Google

About the same time, the works of the blind *Francis Malavale*, of Marseilles, and those of Abbé *d'Estival* and the *Barnabite Lacombe* (*Analysis orationis*), but particularly those of *Jeanne de la Motte Guyon*, a woman of deep and sincere piety, of distinguished talent, and of such purity of life that not even her most malignant enemies dared to asperse her character,[1] were suspected of containing Quietistic errors and of having a strong Quietistic tendency. Born at Montargis, in France, April 13, 1648, of an ancient French family, and educated in several convents, Madame Guyon early manifested a taste for a contemplative life. She was led by reading the works of *St. Francis de Sales* to cultivate a habit of assiduous prayer, which she broke off after a time to give herself up to the seductive attractions of the world, to which she was drawn by a consciousness of her extraordinary beauty. Having contracted at the age of sixteen a marriage, which proved an unhappy one, she began to repine; and longing for comfort and peace of soul, she again resumed the pious practices and close intercourse with God which she had left off when drawn away by the charm of a worldly life. Left a widow at the age of twenty-five, she was now free to prosecute her pious wishes, and in the year 1681 repaired to Gex, where she entered an establishment specially intended for recent converts, over which the Bishop of Geneva had set the Barnabite *Father Lacombe*, who, it seems, instead of discreetly checking the extravagancies of his new charge, showed a disposition to indulge them. Here she devoted herself enthusiastically to ascetical exercises, and, as she fancied, passed through the three stages designated by the Mystics as *absolute indifference*, *spiritual death*, and *interior renewal*. She professed a resolution of giving herself unreservedly to the service of God, but her idea of spiritual life was so false and fantastic that she,

[1] La vie de Mad. de la *Motte Guyon*, écrite par elle-même, Col. 1720, 3 T., 12mo, and Berlin, 1826 (Germ. by *Montenglaut*, Brl. 1826, 3 pts.) La Bible de Mme. *Guyon*, Cologne (Amsterd.), 1715 sq., 20 T. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. IV., p. 836–839; Fr. tr., Vol. 10, p. 229–233. Her Complete Works comprise 39 vols.; they were published by Poiret, Cologne (Amsterdam), 1715, and by Du Joit, Mambrini, 1790, 40 vols.

Hosted by Google

together with Father Lacombe, was banished from Geneva. She shortly after entered the Ursuline convent at Thonon, where she was seized with an irresistible impulse to give her ideas to the world, and accordingly wrote a number of treatises, among which are the following: *A Short and Easy Method of Prayer; Spiritual Torrents*; *Mystical Works;* and *Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures.* From Thonon Madame Guyon went to Paris, where complaints against the dangerous character of her writings brought her under the notice of the archbishop, and on the 29th of January, 1688, she was taken into custody, and shut up in the Convent of the Visitation, but regained her liberty some time later, at the instance of Madame de Maintenon. Lacombe had also been arrested in October, 1687, and obstinately refusing to retract what was objectionable in his *Analysis fidei*, was banished the city, and died out of his mind at Charenton in 1699.

The most objectionable of the tenets of Madame Guyon, and that which appears to have been the *underlying principle* of her teaching, was her theory of self-abnegation. Pure love of God, she said, is so entirely disinterested that it takes no thought of self, puts out of sight all hope of reward and fear of punishment, and makes no account even of salvation. God is loved solely because He is most worthy of love. This love is so completely its own reward that the soul in the enjoyment of it would, were such God's will, consent to be eternally damned.

In the year 1694 the Archbishop of Paris and the Bishop of Chartres condemned her writings; and in the same year a Commission, whose members, consisting of the Bishops of Meaux and Châlons and M. Tronson, the Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, were designated by Fenelon, who himself was the fourth member, was appointed by royal order to examine her works. The sessions took place at Issy, the country-house attached to the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and continued into the year 1695. *Bossuet* presided, but deferred in important matters to M. Tronson, who was a man of great learning and sound judgment.[1] The Commission published

[1] Abbé *Rohrbacher*, Ch. H., Bk. 88, passim. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

as the result of its labors an instrument of Thirty-four Articles, giving a clear and full exposition of true and false mysticism. These Madame Guyon humbly subscribed, solemnly protesting that it was never her intention to pen a line contrary to Catholic doctrine. Bossuet expressed himself satisfied, and gave her a certificate to this effect. It was thought that there was now an end of the controversy on Quietism, which we shall presently see was not the fact. Madame Guyon secretly quitting her asylum at Meaux, where she had remained during the sitting of the Commission at Issy, again went forth, proclaiming her teachings and exhibiting Bossuet's testimonial as à proof of their orthodoxy. She was again placed under arrest and imprisoned, and having finally obtained her freedom, was exiled to *Blois*, where she died a holy and edifying death, June 9, 1717.[1]

She would certainly never have been so well known as she is had it not been for *Fenelon's* relations to her. This pious and celebrated man, believing firmly in the virtue of Madame Guyon and the purity of her love of God, came forward from motives of the most disinterested charity to see that justice was done her. As a refutation of her principles, Bossuet wrote a work *On the States of Prayer* (*Sur les états d'oraison*), to which he requested Fenelon to give his approval. This the latter declined to do, believing the censures of Bossuet to be too severe on the writings of Madame Guyon. From that moment these two great men were estranged, and a controversy ensued, which, painful enough under any circumstances, was made doubly so by the bitterness displayed by the contestants, and at the close of which the extraordinary example of humility given by Fenelon revealed the true nobility and grandeur of his character. Wishing also to give a true exposition of mysticism, without, however, exhibiting the opinions of Madame Guyon in so unfavorable a light as Bossuet had done, he wrote his *Explanations of the Maxims of the Saints in Relation to Interior Life* (1697), giving his views, which were attractive rather than solid, on pure and disinter-

[1] Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la théologie Catholique, art. "Guyon." (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

ested love.[1] Bossuet, fearing the influence of this work would be dangerous in the measure in which the virtue of Fenelon was exalted, the esteem in which he was held great, and the influence he exerted powerful; and conscious that the work gave proof that there the splendid intellect of its author was at its best, at once threw himself fully into the controversy, and in combating false mysticism was not always careful to avoid violating the precepts of the true. Fenelon, who was not in favor at court, was ordered to submit his book to an ecclesiastical tribunal, of which Bossuet was a member; but declining, on the ground that the latter had prejudged the case, was permitted by the king to refer the whole cause to the decision of the Holy See. Pope Innocent XII. appointed a Commission, consisting of ten members, who, after having had the matter in hand for an entire year, in the course of which they held sixty-four protracted sessions, and after innumerable delays, difficulties, and doubts, condemned (March 12, 1699) in general terms the *Maxims of the Saints*, selecting out of the work, however, twenty-three propositions for special notes of censure, some of which were characterized as scandalous, others as dangerous, others as erroneous, and others again as mischievous in practice. The Pope contrived to break the force of so severe a blow, dealt at a bishop so deservedly esteemed, by declaring that "*Fenelon* had erred by the excess of his love of God, but *Bossuet* by lack of love for his neighbor." The sentence reached Fenelon on the 25th of March, just as he was about to go into the pulpit of his cathedral to preach. After reading it aloud to the congregation, he besought his friends, with tears in his eyes, no longer to defend his book, and charged the faithful of his flock to leave off reading it. In a pastoral, dated April 9, addressed to the clergy, secular and regular, of his diocese, he published to the whole of France his cheerful acquiescence in the judgment of the Holy See, and begged all his friends to follow his

[1] Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure, Paris, 1697. *Fénélon*, Lettre(s) à M. de Meaux en réponse aux divers écrits ou mémoires sur le livre des Maximes, etc.—Sur le Quiétisme. (Oeuvres; nouv. edit., Paris, 1838, chez Lefèvre, T. II., p. 481–826.) Cf. *Bossuet*, Lettres sur l'affaire du Quiétisme (Oeuvres; nouv. edit., Paris, 1836, 4to, T. XII., p. 1–514).

Hosted by Google

example. This magnanimous conduct spared the Church the painful consequences of a new schism.

§ 367. *Literature of the Gallican Church.*

(*Picot*), Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France, etc. *Lacrételle*, Histoire de France au XVIIIe siècle; tr. into German by *Sander*, Berlin, 1810, 2 vols.

The *theological literature* produced by the Gallican Church during this epoch is her special glory and that of her clergy, among whom it took its rise. The *restoration of monastic life* and the revival of a higher moral sense and a purer religious spirit during the preceding age, by men like *Francis de Sales* and *Vincent de Paul*, were now showing their salutary and legitimate fruits. The high standard of education received by the clergy in the establishments belonging to the Congregation of *St. Maur*, to the *Oratory*, and the *Sorbonne* also contributed in its own way and measure to bring about the same result. Apart from the influence of dogmatic controversies, the spirit of scientific investigation was evoked by the interminable discussions on ecclesiastical law and the conflicts with Protestantism. The reign of Louis XIV., prosperous and brilliant from the very outset, inspired the French nation with an enthusiasm and self-assertion that quickened its energies and multiplied its powers. This was the *Golden Age of French Literature*, and while it lasted Theology reigned as Queen. The philosophy of the great *Descartes*, admirable as an aid in speculative theology,[1] was neither as well received nor as generally used as it should have been, and seems from the start to have been suspected of being unsound in matters of *faith*.[2] The work, however, was thoroughly appreciated

[1] *Cartesii*, Opp., Frcf. 1692 sq., 2 T., 4to. *Huetii* censura philos. Cartes., Par. 1689, 12mo, ed. IV., 1694. Cf. *Muratori*, De moderat. ingenior. in religion. negotio, lib. II., cap. 13. †*Hock*, Cartesius and His Adversaries, Vienna, 1835, and in the *Freiburg* and *Ashbach's* Eccl. Cyclopaedias, article *Cartesius* or Descartes. Cf. †*Günther* and *Pabst*, The Heads of Ianus, Vienna, 1864, p. 1–10, 223 sq. *Fr. Bouillier*, Histoire et critique de la revolution cartésienne, Paris, 1842.

[2] Descartes expresses his views on this subject in the following sentiments. "Quae nobis a Deo sunt revelata credenda sunt. Et quamvis fortasse lumen

Hosted by Google

by Bossuet. The works of the Oratorian, *Malebranche* († 1715),[1] a disciple of Descartes', a thinker of much depth and originality, and a luminous and elegant writer, exercised no little influence on both the theological method and philosophical researches of *Bossuet*, *Huet*, and others. The *Apology* for Christianity, written by Huet, Bishop of *Avranches* († 1721),[2] and based upon purely historical proofs, such as *miracles* and the fulfillment of the *prophecies*, its aim being to disprove the assertion of the Jews that prophecies in no wise support the claims of Christianity, is, in spite of the great learning of its author, far inferior, both in originality and depth of thought and in the justness of its reflections, to the work of *Pascal* († 1672) on the same subject.[3] The line of argument pursued in *Houteville's* († 1742) Apology is also historical.[4]

The Dogmatical History of Religion by *John Claude Sommier* († 1737) deserves special mention, because from a *psychological point of view*[5] it was far in advance of that age. The

rationis (quam maxime clarum et evidens) aliud quid nobis suggerere *videretur*, soli tamen auctoritati divinae potius quam nostro judicio fides est adhibenda." And further on: "Quamvis non clare intelligimus, tamen non recusabimus illa credere, quae fortasse Deus nobis de se ipso revelet, qualia sunt mysteria Trinitatis et Incarnationis, quae excedunt naturales ingenii nostri vires." Judged correctly by *Perrone*, Historiae theologiae cum philosophia comparatae, synopsis, nr. 61. (Compend. praelect. theol., Vol. I.) Cf. also *Klee*, Dogmatics, Vol. I., p. 31. The critics sitting in judgment on Descartes have frequently forgotten that, Philosophia quaerit, theologia possidet veritatem!

[1] De la recherche de la vérité, 1673; traité de la morale, Rotterd. 1684; traité de la nature et de la grâce, 1682. Cf. *Fénélon*, Réfutation du système de Malebranche sur la nature et la grâce. (Oeuv. nouv. éd., T. III., p. 1–160.)

[2] *Huetii* episc. Abrinc., comment. de reb. ad eum pertin., Amst. 1718. Demonstratio evangelica (1679), Amst. 1680. *Origeniana;* cens. phil. Cartes., etc. Cf. *Tholuck*, Miscellaneous Writings, Hamburg, 1839, Vol. I., p. 247 sq. Dr. *Barach*, Huet as a Philosopher, etc., Vienna, 1862.

[3] *Pensées* sur la religion, etc., Paris, 1669, published with suppressions and modifications, 2 T., and frequently; in their *primitive* complete shape by M. Prosper Faugère, Paris, 1844, 2 T.; transl. into German by *Blech*, with preface by Neander, Berlin, 1839. Oeuvres, La Haye, 1779, 1819, 5 T. *Tholuck*, Miscel. Writ., Vol. I., p. 224–247. *Weingarten*, Pascal as Apologist of Christianity, Lps. 1863; see above, p. 501, note 4.

[4] *Houteville*, la Religion chrétienne prouvée par les faits; edition augmentée, Paris, 1740, 3 vols.; Germ., Frkft. 1745.

[5] Histoire dogmatique de la religion, ou la religion prouvée par l'autorité divine et humaine et par les lumières de la raison, Nancy et Par. 1708 sq., 6 T.

Hosted by Google

writers on *dogmatic theology* were both numerous and able, including such names as *John du Hamel*, the Oratorian; the Dominican, *Natalis Alexander; Charles Witasse*, of the Sorbonne; the Jesuit, *Tournely; Billuart*, the Dominican; *Collet*, and others.[1] These were all men of solid learning, and many of them were gifted with penetrating minds and loftiness of conception, and wrote with remarkable grace and lucidity. In spite of their efforts to exclude from their writings the superfluous distinctions of the Schoolmen, these were found to be almost inseparable from the scholastic methods which they employed. The history of dogma, so auspiciously begun by *Petavius*, was continued by *Thomassin* and *Maran*, both of whom were exceedingly clever, and the latter possibly the rival of Petavius himself.[2] *Moral theology* was still regarded as an appendage to dogmatics, and, in the works enumerated, the two were treated together; the former being frequently incumbered with explanations more properly belonging to Canon Law, or, as is notably the case in the writings of the Jesuits, *Busenbaum*[3] and *Voit*,[4] degraded to mere *casuistry*, and almost hopelessly entangled in the painful controversies on *probabilism*. Still *Malebranche's Treatise on Morals*; the *Moral Essays* of the Jansenist, *Peter Nicole;* and the *Demonstration* of *Bernard Lamy*,[5] the Oratorian, were written in a new and more attractive form. But of all those who labored to spread the truths of Christianity during this epoch, *Salignac*

[1] *Du Hamel*, Theol. speculatrix et practica, juxta SS. PP. dogmata pertractata ad usum scholae accommod., Par. 1691, 7 T.; Ven. 1734, 1 T., f. Thence, Theol. Summarium, Par. 1694, 7 T., 12mo. *Natal. Alex.*, Theol. dogm. et moralis, Par. 1693, 10 T., 8vo., 1703, f. *Witasse*, Tractatus de poenitentia, ordine, eucharistia; de attributis Dei, de Trinit., Incarnatione, etc. (1722), nov. ed., Lovan., 1776, cum notis. *Tournely*, Cursus theologicus scholastico dogmaticus et moralis, pirated ed., Venet. 1728; Col. 1734, and frequently. *Billuart*, Summa S. Thomae hodiern. academiar. moribus accommodata, Par. 1758; Wirceb. 1758, 3 T., f.; Par. 1841 and 1857, 10 vols., 8vo. *Collet*, Institutiones theol. schol. seu theolog. speculativa, Lugd. 1752, 2 T., f.

[2] *Maran*, Divinitas Dom. N. J. Chr. in scriptur. et tradit., ed. nova, Wirceb. 1859. *Thomassin*, Dogmata theologica, Par. 1684 sq., 3 T., f.

[3] See p. 417.

[4] *Voit*, S. J., Theologia moralis, Wirceb. 1769; Ancon. 1841, and frequently, 2 vols.

[5] Démonstration de la vérité et de la sainteté de la morale chrétienne, Par. 1688, 12mo; Rouen, 1705, 5 T.; Germ., Lps. 1737.

Hosted by Google

de la Motte Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambrai († 1715),[1] and *Bossuet*, the great Bishop of Meaux († 1704),[2] stand pre-eminent, and each reflects his own special glory upon his age. Fenelon was gifted with a noble intellect, a clear understanding, an active and fertile imagination, and a candid and magnanimous character. His writings, which were addressed alike to intellect and heart, are remarkable for elevation of thought, which of itself would insure their immortality; breathe a refreshing purity of sentiment; fall with rythmic cadence upon the ear; and are in every way models of an elegant, chaste, limpid, and graceful style. The genius of Bossuet was more soaring; his intellect more brilliant; his mind more quick to grasp and solve the difficulties of a question; his learning more extensive; his style more ornate, eloquent, and majestic; and his temperament tinged with a soft religious melancholy, which, lending attractiveness to a great soul like his, lifts it up to the throne of peace and rest.[3]

In spite of the masterpieces of these extraordinary men, *Church History* was richer in products during this epoch than any other field of theological literature. The labors of the *Congregation of St. Maur*, the *Congregation of the Oratory*, and the *Society of Jesus*, in patristic literature, Christian archaeology, and church history, are so gigantic in quantity, and withal so perfect in execution, that one is simply amazed at the industry and ability of the various authors. Those of greatest name among the Jesuits were the following: *Fronto le Duc*, *Labbe*, *Cossart*, *John Chifflet*, *Petau*, *Sirmond*, and *John Garnier*. Among the Benedictines: *Montfaucon*, *Mabillon*, *Ménard*, *le Nourry*, *Coustant*, *Massuet*, *Ruinart*, *Julian Garnier*, *de la Rue*, *Touttée*, *Martianay*, *Prudence Maran*, *d'Achéry*, *Durand*, and *Martène*. Among the Dominicans: *Combefis*, *Goar*, and *le Quien*. Among the Oratorians: *Morin* and *Thomassin*;

[1] Oeuvres spirit., Amsterd. 1725, 5 T., 12mo; Germ. by *M. Claudius*, Hamburg (2d ed.), 1823, 3 vols., and likewise at *Soleure*. Oeuvres, nouv. édit., Paris, 1838. *Bausset*, Hist. de Fénélon, Paris, 1809, 3 T.; Germ. by *Feder*, Wuerzburg, 1811, 1812, 3 vols.

[2] Oeuv. Ven. 1736 sq., 5 T., 4to; Par. 1744, 4 T., f. Oeuv. posth. Amst. (Par.) 1753, 3 T., 4to. Oeuvr. compl. Par. 1836, 12 T., 4to. *Bausset*, Hist. de Boss., Par. 1814, 4 T.; Germ. by *Feder*, Sulzbach, 1820, 4 vols.

[3] See Vol. I., page 47, note 1.

Hosted by Google

to whom are to be added those other great scholars, whose works will live as long as there exists a theological literature, viz: *Cotelier*, *Launoi*, *Baluze*, *Henri de Valois*, and *Renaudot*. *Du Pin* spent his life in preparing a universal biography of ecclesiastical writers; and his work was supplemented by *Dom Ceillier*, who wrote historical sketches of these authors, and gave lists of their works in chronological order. The Oratorian, *Richard Simon*,[1] may be said to have been the founder of true biblical criticism. Simon was born at Dieppe, May 13, 1638, educated by the Fathers of the Oratory, became afterward one of their number, and in his studies manifested a decided inclination for philology and archaeology. He studied incessantly, laid up great stores of learning, and eventually became one of the greatest biblical critics of his own or any other age. Unhappily, he laid himself open to the assaults of Bossuet and Du Pin by too much freedom and boldness of expression, and by his proneness to overstate and exaggerate. Simon was followed in the same field by *Houbigant*, whose otherwise excellent works on the text of the Old Testament were marred by the pernicious influence of his predecessor. *James Le Long* († 1721) was the author of a bibliography (*Bibliotheca sacra*), containing an account of all the editions and translations of the Scriptures published previously to his time. *Dom Martianay*, of the Congregation of St. Maur († 1717), contributed to advance the science of hermeneutics, as did also *Bernard Lamy*, the Oratorian, by his works, designed to be introductory to a study of the Scriptures.[2] The Jansenist, *de Sacy*, enhanced the value of his translation of the Bible by the addition of learned notes. *Dom Calmet*, the Benedictine, in his commentaries on the whole Bible, does no more than explain the literal sense; still the archaeological learning they contain is very valuable.

[1] *Richard Simon*, Hist. crit. du texte du V. T.; Hist. crit. du N. T.; Hist. crit. des versions du N. T.; Hist. crit. des principaux commentateurs du N. T. On the other side: *Du Pin*, Dissert. préliminaire sur la bible; *Bossuet*, Défense de la Tradition et des Saints Pères. (Oeuv. nouv. éd., Par. 1836, T. II., p. 120–329.) *Graf*, Richard Simon (in Supplements to theological literature, nro. 1, Strasburg, 1847).

[2] Apparatus ad biblia sacra, etc., Gratianopoli, 1687, f.

Hosted by Google

But among the French ecclesiastics and scholars of this age, there were not alone classical Church historians like *Tillemont*, *Fleury*, *Natalis Alexander*, *Bossuet*, *Harduin*, *Labbe*, and *Cossart*, but also pulpit orators, whose powers of eloquence, wealth of thought, rhetorical skill, and faultless style were literally marvelous. Among these, putting aside *Fenelon* and *Bossuet*, may be named *Fléchier*, Bishop of Nîmes († 1710), who employed his flowery, elevated, and correct style to bring all human greatness under the yoke of the Cross;[1] *Bourdaloue*, of the Society of Jesus († 1704),[2] who, if not so finished or so brilliant as those already mentioned, was more vigorous and solid, and must unquestionably be ranked as one of the greatest of pulpit instructors and orators; *Massillon*, Bishop of Clermont († 1742), unsurpassed in his knowledge of the human heart, and in the skill with which he depicts man in conflict with his passions. His sermons and ecclesiastical conferences were a reflex of his character, exhibiting a happy blending of severity and tenderness, zeal and prudence, which are the natural expression of strong religious feeling, and a deep sense of the responsibility of the pastoral office;[3] and finally, Father *Bridaine* († 1767), a popular orator and an energetic and successful missionary.[4]

§ 368. *Decline of Religious and Theological Science in France—Influence of the Free thinkers of England.*

Abbé *Barruel*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme, T. I., written in England, 1797. (*Stark, J. Aug. von*), Triumph of Philosophy in the

[1] Panégyriques des saints; Oraisons funèbres; Sermons.

[2] Oeuvres complètes, best ed. by *Rigaud*, Paris, 1708–1734, 16 vols.; Versailles, 1812, 16 vols.; nouv. ed., Paris, 1829, 16 vols.; 1838, 5 vols. His life was written by Mme. de Pringy. (Tr.)

[3] *Massillon*, Oeuvres complètes, 12 vols., published by his nephew, in 1745, 1746; later editions are those of Beaucé (4 vols., 1817); Méquignon, 15 vols., 1818, 3 vols., Paris, 1838; and Chalandre (3 vols., 1847). The "*Ecclesiastical Conferences*," which, along with the *Petit carême*, established his reputation; tr. into English by *Boylan*, of Maynooth; publ. at Dublin, 1825, in 2 vols.; then dedicated to the Right Rev. John Machale, "out of gratitude for long and distinguished services!" (Tr.)

[4] Sermons du Père *Bridaine*, Avignon, 1827, 7 vols. Cf. *Maury*, Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire, Paris, 1810.

Hosted by Google

Eighteenth Century, Frkft. 1803, 2 pts.; revised by *Buchfelner*, Landshut, 1834. *Binder*, History of the Philosophical and Revolutionary Age, with Respect to Ecclesiastical Affairs, Schaffh. 1844, 2 vols. *Walch*, Modern History of Religion, Vols. I.–III. *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., p. 265. *Gfroerer*, Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II.. p. 388–556. *Cesare Cantù*, Univ. Hist., Vol. XI.

At the close of the age which has been just reviewed, and which shed so much glory upon the Church of France, a decline in religious sentiment set in, and progressed with startling rapidity. The immediate causes of this change are to be sought in the events that took place during the regency of the *Duke of Orleans*, and in the frightful immorality prevalent at court, where religion, no longer held in honor, and ceasing to be more than a routine ceremony and an external form, became an object of derisive mockery to those who still condescended to pay a semblance of respect to what they no longer regarded as other than a barren worship. And the spirit of irreligion that came into fashion at court went down from rank to rank, until in the end it reached the lowest stratum of society. The deplorable issue of the Jansenistic controversy also contributed in its way to the extinction of the religious sentiment and to make piety ridiculous. The very foundations of the teaching on morals were loosened by the heated controversy on *Probabilism*, which the Jesuits defended with zealous warmth and the witty Jansenists assailed with caustic severity. Scepticism in historical studies, whence it spread to every other branch of science and literature, leaving everywhere the baneful effects of its presence, found favor with some of the members of the great Society of Jesus, a few of whom, like *Harduin*[1] († 1729) and his disciple, *Ber-*

[1] It would seem that Harduin put forward his opinions rather from love of paradox and desire of notoriety than from any serious belief in their truth. Putting aside the writings of *Cicero*, *Pliny's* Natural History, *Virgil's* Georgics, the comedies of *Plautus*, and the Satires of *Horace*, in Latin, and in Greek *Homer's* Iliad and the History of *Herodotus*, he maintained that all the rest of the works included in the body of ancient classical literature were falsely attributed to the authors whose names they bore, being really the productions of monks of the thirteenth century. He was equally incredulous with regard to ancient coins and the specimens of art which have been unanimously ascribed to the classic age. Even the authors of the Septuagint version of the

Hosted by Google

ruyer († 1758), carried it to a dangerous excess. The latter professed to regard the Old Testament as no more than a mere romance,[1] and greatly scandalized the faithful by the profane flippancy of his writings. His works, though condemned by ecclesiastical authority and censured by the members of his own Society, had an unprecedented sale, and were read with avidity.[2] Religious sentiment gradually died out, and anything approaching an appreciative knowledge of Christianity became extinct. Honest historical research and laborious investigation were discontinued, and in their place sprung up a wordy and pretentious science, which was dignified by the name of philosophy, and faithfully reflected the spirit and tendency of the age.

England,[3] now Protestant to its very core, was held up to the world as the land of freedom of thought, and the teaching of her philosophers was hailed with general applause. The *empiricism* of *Locke* († 1704), which necessarily issued in rank *materialism*, was received with particular favor in France. Too profligate and too effete to give birth to any original ideas themselves, the leaders of thought and the representatives of learning tamely submitted to accept a philosophy that made the five senses of man the supreme intellectual

Old Testament did not escape the censure of his sceptical incredulity, and he also endeavored to show that those portions of the New Testament, which are known to have been originally written in Greek, were really written in Latin. He was required by the authorities of the Society to retract these expressions of opinion; but it is said that, having been expostulated with by a friend and a member of the Society, who represented to him that people were greatly shocked at his paradoxical absurdities, he replied: "Now do you really think that I should have risen every morning of my life at four o'clock to say over again what others have said before me?" Abbé *Rohrbacher*, Hist. Univ. de l'Église Cath., Vol. 26, Bk. 88, pp. 107 sq.; also *Feller's* Biogr.-Dict. (Tr.)

[1] Histoire du peuple de Dieu, etc., Paris et la Haye, 1728, 7 vols., 4to, or 10 vols., 12mo; 1758, 14 vols. Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 852; Fr. tr., Vol. 3, p. 29 sq.

[2] "Les condamnations dont la (cette histoire) frappèrent les évêques de Montpellier et Soissons, l'assemblée du clergé à Conflans, la Sorbonne, et les papes Benoit XIV et Clement XIII, lui firent un succès immerité." So *Dictionnaire Général de Biographie et d'Histoire*, Paris, 1869, 2 vols. (Tr.)

[3] *Thorschmid*, Essay of a Complete Library of Free-thinkers, Halle, 1765 sq., 4 vols. Cf. *Leo*, Manual of Univ. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 173 sq.

Hosted by Google

criterion, and gave matter dominion over mind. Lord *Edward Herbert of Cherbury* († 1648) had already maintained that the divine character of Christianity might be shown to be probable, but could not be demonstrated with absolute certainty; and that to believe in God, to live virtuously, to be penitent for sins and mend one's life, and to be persuaded that good deeds will be rewarded and evil punished in the life to come, are conditions quite sufficient for salvation.

Toland, an Irishman by birth († 1722), questioned the authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures, reviled the clergy, and attempted to prove that *Christianity is not mysterious*, and that the Gospel contains nothing above reason.[1] Lord *Shaftesbury*, a disciple of Locke's († 1713), seized every available occasion to cast ridicule upon the Bible, the prophecies, and miracles; making his assaults all the more dangerous by veiling a delicate irony under a simulated reverence for religion. The same tactics were followed by *Anthony Collins* († 1729), with whom the name *Freethinker* originated. *Thomas Woolston* († 1733), in a work published in 1705, and supplemented by others in succeeding years, put an allegorical interpretation upon the whole of the Bible, maintaining that the personages of the Old Testament were typical and not real; that the miracles of both the Old and the New were only admirably contrived allegories;[2] and that the Gospel narratives were a tissue of absurdities.[3]

Tindal, a Doctor of Laws († 1733), who was an avowed enemy of priests and of the ministers of every form of religion,[4] made a powerful attack upon the miraculous character of the Gospel, denying the necessity of revelation, and maintaining that human reason was all-sufficient.[5]

[1] His most important work is that entitled, "Christianity not Mysterious; A Treatise showing that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to Reason or above it," London, 1696. (Tr.)

[2] The Old Apology of the Truth of the Christian Religion against the Jews and Gentiles revived, London, 1705. (Tr.)

[3] Discourses (six) on the Miracles of Christ, London, 1727 sq. (Tr.)

[4] Rights of the Christian Church asserted against the Romish and all other Priests, etc., London, 1706. (Tr.)

[5] Christianity as old as the Creation, or the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature, London, 1730. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

William Lyon († 1713) proclaimed the infallibility of human reason, and asserted that, inasmuch as a divine revelation is inconceivable, and miracles can not be demonstrated, the ecclesiastical state is of purely human invention and a perpetual imposture. *David Hume*, the celebrated historian († 1776), was arrogantly sceptical, denying outright the truth of Christianity, and asserting that polytheism was the oldest form of religion, from which, as time went on, came monotheism, and from this again *pure Deism*, which of all beliefs mostly commends itself to the reason.[1]

"Indifference in matters of religion," said *Bossuet*, "is the bane of our age. It is openly avowed in England and Holland, and is not unfrequently to be met with even among Catholics. I am convinced that the influence of the Freethinkers will decline, not indeed because their opinions are abhorred, but because of the spirit of indifference to everything but gain and pleasure." The apathy which the great Bishop of Meaux so pathetically deplored opened the way to the introduction into France of the spirit of irreligion, which was rapidly succeeded by a rancorous hostility to every form of Christianity. This hatred was intensified by the action of the clergy, who, taking advantage of the restrictions of the press, which was not so free in France as on the other side of the channel, endeavored to wrench the weapons from the hands of their adversaries. These were not so easily silenced. They began to publish accounts of travel in distant lands, in which, under disguises more or less thin, they assailed Christianity and the Church, ridiculing both as institutions peculiar to the far-away peoples whom they had visited. Such was the character of *Vairesse's* History of the *Sévérambes*;[2] the Voyage and Adventures of *James Massé*, by *Simon Tyssot de Patot*; a Description of the Island of Borneo, by

[1] His most important religious work, Dialogues concerning Natural Religion, was completed in 1751, but, owing to the advice of friends, not published until 1778, about two years after his death. (Tr.) *Lechler*, History of Deism in England, Stuttg. 1841. *Riffel*, Deism in England and its Echo in Germany (The "*Catholic*," 1848, nros. 36–38, 40, 41). *Freiburg* Cyclop., art. "*Deism*" and "*Deists*."

[2] Hist. des Sévérambes, Paris, 1677 sq., 3 T., 12mo; Sulzbach, 1689, 3 vols.

Hosted by Google

Fontenelle; the Persian Letters, by *Montesquieu;* and the Life of Mohammed, by Count *Henri de Bouillon-Villers* († 1722), in which the author endeavors to show that Mohammedanism is superior to Christianity. The sceptic *Bayle* was the persistent and malignant foe of the Bible, maintaining in his *Critical and Historical Dictionary*, through which his attacks were made, that society could not only go on perfectly well without religion, but would be greatly improved by its absence.

These isolated assaults were subsequently made more effective by a permanent organization of a number of conspirators against the Christian name, who had sworn to bring about the total overthrow of the Church. Their cry was "*Crush the infamous thing!*" (*Écrasez l'infame!*) meaning the Christian religion and Christ its Head. At the head of the conspirators was *Francis Mary Arouet*, or, as he called himself, *Voltaire*, a young man and a poet of extraordinary ability, who, as *Condorcet*, his panegyrist, relates, had taken a solemn oath "to devote his whole life to the work of destroying Christianity, and with it all positive religion." Hence the one uniform theme of his discourses and writings, presented under an endless variety of forms during his long and chequered career, was summed up in the assertion that the Christian religion is the invention of priests.[1] He died in 1778. His principal accomplices were *d'Alembert*, whose tactics consisted in attempting to stifle religion by skillfully contrived stratagems; *Diderot*, who openly professed himself an atheist; and *Damilaville*, of whom Voltaire said that he did not deny, but *hated God.* Their most important work against Christianity, and indeed against all positive religion, was the *Encyclopaedia*, published under the editorial management of d'Alembert and Diderot. Perhaps no work ever published did as much to propagate error and irreligion. The dishonesty of the editors is apparent from the fact that they uniformly substituted the term "*nature*" in texts in

[1] *Stark-Buchfelner*, l. cit., p. 34 sq. *Robiano*, T. I., p. 300 sq. *Harel*, Voltaire, particularités curieuses de sa vie et de sa mort., etc. Paris, 1817. Cf. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of the French Revolution, Vol. I., p. 7–10.

Hosted by Google

which the words God and Providence occur. *Condillac* († 1780), *Helvetius*, and the infamous *Julian Offroy de la Mettrie* professed themselves pure materialists. In their works nature holds the place of God; spirit is only a form of matter; and all religion is a political institution, invented by priests, and capable of deceiving none but idiots.[1] Even the great *Buffon* frequently fails, in his Natural History, to distinguish between God and nature, between mind and matter. The astronomer, *Lalande*, studied the heavens without having his mind lifted up to their Maker, and in all his works the name of God does not occur once. All of these, including *Volney* († 1820) and *Dupuis* († 1809), denied the reality of biblical personages,[2] and pronounced the Gospel narrative the reverie of an astronomer.

If *Rousseau* († 1778) at times spoke respectfully and even eloquently of Christianity, he was no less audacious than his colleagues in his attacks on the miracles of the Gospel, and on the whole history of the Bible, which, he said, so bristled with contradictions that no reasonable man could give credence to it. Such is the spirit that runs through the famous *Profession de foi du Vicaire Savoyard*, and through his still more famous pedagogical utopia, *Emile*.[3] His hostility to Christianity is still more pronounced in the "*Contrat Social*," where he charges the Christian religion with having severed the unity of States, extinguished the spirit of patriotism, pandered to the designs of tyrants, and annihilated the manly virtues. Finally, a society of a political character was formed, whose members, calling themselves *Economists* or "*Physiocrats*," demanded unrestricted freedom of trade and industry; absolute equality in the distribution of public offices; and a complete and thorough revolution in all established and tra-

[1] Ceci est exageré quant à Condillac, quoique 'il n'y ait pas loin du sensualisme ou matérialisme. (Note of the French translators.—Tr.)

[2] *Volney*, Ruins; Reflections upon the Revolutions of Empires, published in 1794; the year previous he published the Natural Laws. In the former work he maintains, with a great deal of sarcasm and mockery, the human origin and essential falsity of *all* religious systems; in the latter he treats morality as a physical and material science. (Tr.) *Dupuis*, Origine de tous les cultes, Paris, 1794, 12 vols.

[3] *Stark-Buchfelner*, l. c., pp. 80 sq.

Hosted by Google

ditionary methods and systems; held out illusory and utopian promises of unbounded wealth and material prosperity; declared war against Christianity; pronounced belief in God an evidence of mental infirmity; and rejected the views of Voltaire and Rousseau as entirely too moderate, and deserving only a contemptuous dismissal from men of more "advanced" thoughts.

To the reflecting and far-seeing the evils that then afflicted the Church of France were a certain presage of an approaching catastrophe. *Labat* († 1803), a member of the Congregation of St. Maur, and *Neuville*, the celebrated preacher, spoke out in sorrowful and eloquent accents, warning their countrymen of the dangers that threatened at once the altar of God and the throne of the king. The French clergy, in two assemblies, held respectively in 1765 and 1770, drew the attention of the king to the dangerous character of the writings of the Freethinkers, and proposed a plan of arresting the progress of the wicked conspiracy.[1] A memorial, that appeared shortly after, set men to thinking still more seriously of the dangers that were ahead, and of the necessity of adopting some means to avert them. Men of ability and learning published works in defense of Christianity and the commonwealth, both of which were menaced with destruction, if something were not done, and that speedily, to prevent a great social, political, and religious convulsion. The parliament was convoked by order of the attorney-general, *Séguier*,[2] and, on the representations of the clergy, condemned seven notoriously scandalous works, and ordered them to be burnt. But beyond this that body did nothing in the cause of truth and religion. The enemies of the Christian name were conscious that they were daily gaining in number and growing in influence. Foreign princes, ministers of state, and other officials joined their ranks, and, strengthened by the accession and aided by the influence of powerful statesmen like

[1] Avertissement du clergé de France sur les dangers de l'incrédulité.

[2] "Réquisitoire, sur lequel est intervenu l'arrêt du Parlement, année 1770," printed by injunction of the king. Cf. *Walch*, Modern Religious History, Pt. I., p. 471–486; Pt. II., p. 3 sq. *Robiano*, l. cit., T. II., p. 53.

Hosted by Google

Choiseul and *Malesherbes*, they succeeded in largely controlling establishments for the education of youth. *Malesherbes* being, in virtue of his office of Director of the Library, Censor of the Press, placed no obstacle in the way of the publication and circulation of the irreligious works of the day. The torrent of evil had been hourly gaining strength, and was now irresistible. Strange to say, at the very time that a spirit of frivolity and thoughtlessness was dominant in Church and Society, and working the ruin of both, a Religious Order was founded, whose Rule was more severe than that of any body that had ever existed in the Church. *Le Bouthillier de Rancé*,[1] a wealthy and learned prelate, who, after having spent the flower of his youth in the excesses of gay and fashionable dissipation, became a prey to the poignant upbraidings of conscience, entered the convent of Cîteaux de *la Trappe* (1662), in the diocese of Sens, of which he was from his youth destined to be the abbot. He restored the primitive severity of the Rule, and so great was the austerity practiced by the Trappists, as the disciples of Rancé were now called, that they were forbidden even to *speak* to each other or to cultivate any of the branches of *science*. Against the latter prohibition the learned Benedictine, *John Mabillon*, wrote his *Traité des études monastiques* (*De studiis monasticis*). Bossuet, to clear the controversy that followed of its obscurity and confusion, pointed out the fact that Rancé, in discussing the subject, had failed to make a necessary distinction between the conditions proper to the life of a hermit and those proper to that of a monk living in a community.

Notwithstanding the extreme austerity of the Order, numbers came to seek admission into it, and when the horrors of

[1] *Holsten.-Brockie*, T. VI., p. 569. *Rancé*, Traité de la sainteté et des devoirs de la vie monastique, 1683, 2 T., 4to. Against it: *Mabillon*, Traité des études monast., 1691, and frequently; in Latin, De studiis monasticis. *Marsollier*, Vie de l'abbé de la Trappe, Par. 1703, 2 T., 12mo. L. D. B., Hist. civile, rel. et littér. de l'abbaye de la Tr., Par. 1824. *Exauvillez*, Vie de l'abbé de Rancé, Par. 1842. *Chateaubriand*, Vie de Rancé, Par. 1844; Germ., Ulm. 1844. *Gaillardin*, Les Trappistes ou l'ordre de Citeaux au XIX. siècle; histoire de la Trappe depuis sa fondation jusqu'à nos jours, Par. 1844, T. I. (to 1790). Cf. *Supplementum* ad Natal. Alex. h. e., Bingae, 1791, p. 689–704. *Dubois*, Histoire de l'abbé de Rancé, etc., Paris, 1866.

Hosted by Google

the Revolution and the glories of the Empire had become things of the past, it still flourished and put forth fresh tokens of life and energy. Rancé died in 1700.

§ 369. *The Catholic Church in Italy and Spain.*

While the Church of France was in conflict, that of Italy enjoyed comparative peace and quiet, at least until toward the close of the French Revolution, when the events of that stirring period began to produce their effects to the south of the Alps. The Pope, as has been already stated, had been engaged in warm controversies with many of the European sovereigns, and had met them all single-handed. His heart was cheered, however, by the evidences of religious activity and a healthy religious tone visible in his own and the neighboring States. The bishops were untiring in their efforts to revive the faith of the people, and *missions* were becoming daily more frequent. To the older orders devoted to this apostolic work another was now added, namely, the *Redemptorist*, founded by *St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori*.[1] Alphonsus was born at Naples, of a noble family, in 1696, and, after having made a successful course of law studies, and practiced at the bar with distinction, threw up the profession in disgust, and, placing himself unreservedly in the hands of God, saying, "O, Lord, here I am, do with me as Thou willest," began the study of theology, was ordained a priest in 1722, and two years later entered the Society of Missionaries of the *Propaganda* at Naples. As a priest he devoted himself mainly to preaching and the direction of souls, and in the course of a mission, given in the neighborhood of Amalfi, in which he took an active part, was pained to learn that the country people there and elsewhere had their spiritual wants but indifferently cared for. Grieved at the sight of so much spiritual poverty among people so destitute of this world's goods, he took comfort in the thought that he would one day found a congregation whose members would supply them religious

[1] *A. Giatini*, Vita del beato Alfonso Liguori, Roma, 1815, 4to; Germ., Vienna, 1835. *Jeancard*, Vie du bienheureux Alphonse Liguori, Marseille et Louvain, 1829.

Hosted by Google

instruction, and give themselves up wholly to their service. Authorized by Pope Clement XII., he founded in the year 1732 the Congregation of the *Most Holy Redeemer*, composed of secular priests, who were willing to spend their lives in instructing the people and training the young. Their Rule was published June 21, 1742, and their founder intrusted with the supreme direction of the Order, under the name of Superior-General.[1]

Obstacles that had not been anticipated stood in the way of the accomplishment of the wise and benevolent designs of the founder, and it required all his strength of character and patient perseverance to remove them. The world persisted in misunderstanding or misinterpreting the aims of the *Redemptorists*, claiming that they were only Jesuits under another name, and, as such, worthy of all the calumny and persecution with which that body was so unjustly pursued; but their incessant and disinterested labors eventually established beyond all question the purity of the motives by which their founder was inspired, and the world practically, if not formally, confessed its mistake.

Originally the missions of the Redemptorists opened with a sermon, announcing to the inhabitants of the town, village, or district that their purpose in coming among them was *to revive a religious spirit and to correct morals*, and calling upon them to be regular in their attendance at the instructions, to receive the Sacraments, and to observe, as far as circumstances would permit, the rules laid down for the conduct of the spiritual exercises. A short instruction was given in the morning, and in the evening a more elaborate discourse was preached. In the selection of subjects, the order laid down in the Exercises of St. Ignatius was mainly followed, the leading ones being the end and fall of man, the misery entailed by sin, and the justice and judgment of God. In the course of the exercises discourses were given on the mercy of God through Jesus Christ, on the merits of the Savior, on the nature and use of prayer, on the fruits of penance, on the

[1] Their Constitution and Rule is found in German, in the January nro. of the Journal "*Sion*" of 1842 (nros. 7 sq.) Cf. *Henrion-Fehr*, Vol. II., p. 217 sq.

Hosted by Google

frequentation of the Sacraments, and on other kindred subjects. The closing discourse was usually a stirring and powerful appeal, exhorting the people to persevere in the way on which they had so happily entered during the mission. While these missions were in progress, public officials and persons of the highest rank and station came forward to offer their services in instructing the people and the children, under the direction of the Redemptorists. In the year 1762, while engaged in these apostolic labors, Alphonsus de Liguori was appointed Bishop of *Sant' Agata dei Goti*, in the kingdom of Naples, where he displayed all the virtues of a pontiff wholly devoted to the welfare of his flock. Though a laborious and model bishop, he never ceased to take the liveliest interest in his congregation, to which he returned in the year 1775, after resigning his see, from the responsibilities of which he shrank. He was now far advanced in age and broken in health, and, after spending a few more years among his spiritual children, whom he loved so well, he died surrounded by them at Nocera on the 1st of August, 1787. His life had been wholly spent in the service of God, and his memory, his deeds, and above all his example, have been held in grateful remembrance by the faithful, but particularly by those of his own household. His *numerous writings* have been a guide and comfort to many souls [1] in these latter days, and have given him rank

[1] He left a number of theological and devotional works, including, beside others, Theol. Mor., Naples, 1755; author's 9th and best ed., 1785; Directorium Ordinandor., Venice, 1758; Opera Dogmatica, 1770; Istoria di tutte l'eresie con loro confutazione, 3 vols., 8vo, 1773; Istruzione pratica per i confessori della gente di campagna, 3 vols., Bassano, 1780; Homo Apostolicus Instructus in sua Vocatione, 3 vols., 4to, Venice, 1782; and Le glorie di Maria, 2 vols., 8vo, 1784. Various other editions of his works: Collezione completa delle opere di St. Alphon. Maria de Liguori, Monza, 1839 sq., 68 vols., 12mo. Opere complete (exclusa *theologia morali*), Venez. 1833 sq., 60 vols.; tr. fr. the Ital. into Germ., by *Hugues*, Ratisb. 1842–47, in three sections, *ascetical, dogmatical*, and *moral* works. His Theologia moralis, in many editions; the best, cura *P. Mich. Heilig*, Mechlin. et Mogunt. 1845 sq., 10 T.: *M. Haringer*, Ratisb. 1846; also that of Ancona, 1842, in 6 vols., is a good edition; Homo apostolicus s. praxis et instructio confessariorum, Mogunt. 1842; Germ., Ratisbon, 1841; Aix-la-Chapelle, 1842. His complete works were translated into French in 30 vols., 8vo., 1834 sq. Of the Oeuvres Complètes de S. Alphonse de Liguori traduites de l'italien et mises en ordre par les pères *Leop. Dujardin* et *Jules Jacques*, C. SS. R., the following seven vols. have appeared:

Hosted by Google

among the great teachers of the Church. He was solemnly canonized by Gregory XVI. on the feast of Pentecost, 1839, and declared a Doctor of the Church by Pius IX., March 23, 1871.

During this season of apparent lethargy, Italy produced both saints and scholars, and of the latter some were known throughout the whole of Europe. *Denina*, a professor of Turin, published a practical introduction to the study of theology of considerable merit. Of the *Popes*, several wrote elegant verses, but as an author *Benedict XIV.*[1] was the most distinguished among them. *Muratori*,[2] a friend of Benedict XIV., employed his splendid talents and his extensive erudition in writing works on history and other subjects, which will be held in esteem for all time, wherever scholarship is valued or literary finish appreciated. He was also instrumental in bringing theologians, who were still under the influence of the sharp and rude polemics of a former age, to be more temperate in tone, more dignified in manner, and more scholarly in method. Cardinal *Bona* († 1674) published valuable works on liturgy and asceticism;[3] Cardinal *Noris* some

Oeuvres Dogmatiques; Verité de la foi, 2 vols., Paris, 1866; Triomphe de l'église, Paris, 1867–1870; Défense des Dogmes Catholiques, 2 vols., Paris, 1871, 1872. His "*Selva*," 2 T., Paris and Lyons, 1854; Preparation for Death, Boston, 1851; Sermons, the Glories of Mary, Visits to the Most Bl. Sacr., and many other of his devotional works have been translated into English, and frequently republished. Cfr. *Villecourt*, Vie de S. Alphonse, T. 4. (Tr.)

[1] Cf., above, § 363, p. 489, note 1. The most valuable and best known works of this Pope are: De Servorum Dei beatificatione et Beatorum canonizatione; De sacrificio missae; De festis Christi et Mariae; Institutiones ecclesiasticae; De Synodo Dioecesana, in many edit., Mechl. 1823. The best edit. of the complete works of Benedict XIV. is that by the Spanish Jesuit, *Azevedo*, Rome, 1747–51, in 13 vols., 4to; another far-spread ed. is that of Prato, 1842 sq., in 18 vols., 4to. There is an ed. of his De beatif. et canoniz. SS., in 7 vols., fol., Bassano, 1778 (the Rom. ed. has but 5 vols.), and his Bullarium, in 4 vols., fol., Venice, 1768. There is an Engl. transl., in 3 vols., On Heroic Virtue, being part of De Beatif., etc. (Tr.)

[2] Scriptores rer. Ital.; Antiquitates Ital. med. aevi.; Liturgia Romana vetus, Ven. 1728, 2 T., fol. De moderatione ingeniorum in religionis negotio, whereof there are numerous editions, Aug. Vind. 1779; partially transl. into Germ., by *Biunde* and *Braun*, Coblenz, 1837.

[3] *Bona*, De rebus liturgicis, and several other valuable works: De sacrificio missae tractatus asceticus, ed. *Sintzel*, Ratisb. 1841; Manuductio ad coelum; De principiis vitae chr. (opp. Tur. 1747 sq., 4 T. fol.)

Hosted by Google

excellent dissertations on the Pelagian controversies and other subjects;[1] and Cardinal *Tommasi*, besides his liturgical and exegetical writings, some profound works on the Fathers.[2] *Mamachi*, *Selvaggio*, and *Pelliccia* devoted themselves to the study of ecclesiastical antiquities; and *Orsi*, *Saccarelli*, *Berti*, and others to that of Church history. *Dominic Mansi* edited the fullest collection of the Councils ever published;[3] the Jesuit, *Tiraboschi* († 1794), wrote a most exhaustive and accurate *History of Italian Literature*,[4] embracing both ancient and modern Italy. *Genér*, a Spaniard, and a member of the same Society, wrote a dogmatical work in six volumes, quarto, which, although never completed, is very valuable, from the fact that he works into his subject all the information he could derive from the Christian inscriptions and pictorial representations which in his day had been brought to light in the Catacombs; *John Bernard de' Rossi*, a professor at Parma, was a diligent and laborious critic of the Old Testament, and published an excellent collection of the various readings of the text;[5] and *Martini*, Archbishop of Florence, made an Italian translation of the Bible, adding short explanatory notes (fr. 1784), which, having been approved and warmly recommended by Pope *Pius VI.*, went through many editions, and is still in use at the present day. The best edition of the works of St. Jerome was prepared by *Dominic Vallarsi*, of Verona; and the best edition of those of St. Hilary by *Scipio Maffei*. *Andrew Gallandi*, a Father of the Oratory, edited the best collection of the works of the earliest Fathers and ecclesiastical writers; and the Brothers *Assemani* published a collection of the literary treasures of the Eastern Church. The *Ballerini* brothers published a series of clever dissertations on

[1] Works, Verona, 1729–1732, 5 vols., fol.

[2] Institutiones theologiae antiquorum Patrum, Romae, 1709–1712, 8 T.

[3] Brought down to A. D. 1439, 31 vols.

[4] His *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* (13 vols., Modena, 1772–83; best ed., 16 vols., Milan, 1822–26) extends from the earliest times to the end of the seventeenth century. A continuation, embracing the literature of the eighteenth century, was written by *Lombardi*. (TR.)

[5] He collected and collated in all six hundred and eighty Hebrew MSS., in addition to the five hundred and eighty which Kennicott had collected. *Dixon's* Intr. to the S. Scriptures, p. 71. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

the works of *Leo the Great*, designed as a refutation of those written by *Quesnel*,[1] and made some valuable contributions to the science of Canon Law. Fresh activity and wider scope were given to the intellectual movement by the action of *Leopold*, Grand Duke *of Tuscany*, who attempted to introduce into his States the reforms of his brother, Joseph II. He was seconded in this design by *Scipio Ricci*,[2] Bishop of Pistoja and Prato, who, in 1786, at a *diocesan synod*, convened in the former city, presented for the acceptance of his clergy an instrument containing fifty-seven articles, setting forth the principles of the Gallican Church and the extreme teachings of Jansenism.[3] Doubtful of the temper of his clergy, he had provided against defeat by calling to the Synod a number of ecclesiastics from the neighboring States, of whose sentiments he was assured, and among whom was the ultra-Gallican professor of Pavia, *Peter Tamburini*. The great bulk of the decisions arrived at by the Synod were erroneous, being in direct opposition to the teaching and the practice of the Church. They related chiefly to the government of the Church; to the authority of Councils; to the manner of holding divine worship, which, it was said, should be conducted in the language of the people; to the number of altars; to the veneration of images, etc. The system of Quesnel was approved; the Grand Duke was accorded privileges wholly irreconcilable with the rights of the Church; and it was maintained that in the future only *one* Religious Order should be permitted in the Church, and that all the houses of that one should adopt the Rule of the Jansenistic convent of Port-Royal.

Encouraged by this success, Leopold summoned the seventeen bishops of Tuscany to meet him at Florence (1787), with a view to introducing the acts of the Synod of Pistoja into all the dioceses of his dominions. He soon learned that he

[1] Ed. corrected on the authority of Vatican MSC., Venice, 1755–57, 3 vols. See Vol. I., p. 49 sq.

[2] Cf. *Huth*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., p. 555 sq. *Robiano*, T. II., p. 72 sq.

[3] The acts published by *Schwarzel*, Acta congregat. archiepiscop. et espiscopor., etc., Hetruriae, etc., Bamberg. et Herbip. 1790 sq., 7 T. See **Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. VIII., p. 467–480; Fr. tr., Vol. 18, p. 337 sq.

Hosted by Google

had mistaken the temper of the bishops, by the larger number of whom he was so vigorously opposed, and having dissolved the synod, was shortly afterward informed that the populace, infuriated at the treachery of Ricci, had demolished his palace (1787).

Joseph II. died in 1790, and Leopold immediately left Tuscany to ascend the imperial throne. The excitement spread into every diocese of Tuscany, and so fierce was the popular indignation that Ricci was eventually forced to resign. The acts of the Synod of Pistoja, which the creatures of the government were actively engaged in circulating, were condemned by Pope *Pius VI.* in the bull *Auctorem fidei* (1794),[1] which Ricci, after considerable delay and hesitancy, finally subscribed (1799). He gave a fresh proof of the sincerity of his retractation at Florence in 1805, on the occasion of the return of *Pius VII.* from France.

In *Spain* the intellectual movement, which in some respects had the same characteristics as that of France, was mainly confined to the branches of *dogmatic theology* and *canon law.* As in the preceding epoch, the Spanish Church had produced theologians of the greatest name, like Melchior Cano, Vega, Salmeron, Toletus, Maldonatus, Montanus, Bañez, de Lugo, Molina, Vasquez, Suarez, and others, so also in the present one she was not without creditable representatives in the queen of sciences. Of these may be mentioned *Thyrsus Gonzales*, who subsequently became General of the Society of Jesus († 1705), and who was the author of a work entitled *Manuductio ad conversionem Muhametanorum*, and a refutation of the theory of probabilism (see Thesaur. libr. Cathol., Vol. I.); *Emmanuel Bernard de Ribera* († 1765), the author of a work on philosophy (*Institutiones philosophicae*); and finally *Florez*, an Augustinian Friar, who commenced the great national work *La España sagrada*, published at Madrid between the years 1747 and 1779, in twenty-nine volumes, quarto.

[1] It is found in the Leipsic stereotyped edition of the Council of Trent, pp. 292–327.

Hosted by Google

§ 370. *The Catholic Church in Germany.*

Cam. Paganel, Hist. of Joseph II., Emperor of Germany, Lps. 1844, 2 vols. *Lorenz*, Joseph II. and the Belgian Revolution, Vienna, 1862. "Joseph II. and His Age; the Liberty of the Press under Joseph II." (*Historical* and *Political Papers*, Vols. III. and VIII.) *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII. *Sebastian Brunner*, Theological Flunkeyism at the Court of Joseph II.; Secret Correspondence and Disclosures from Unpublished Documents, found in the R. and I. Archives, Vienna, 1868. *Ritter*, Emp. Joseph II. and His Reforms; Appendix, "Pius VI.'s Journey to Vienna," Ratisbon 1868. *Wolf*, The Abolition of the Monasteries in Austria, Vienna, 1871 *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. V., p. 794 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 12.

The repose secured to Germany by the Peace of Westphalia gradually degenerated into a dangerous lethargy, which lasted for above a century; and when at length *Maria Teresa* ascended the throne, and Austria began to give tokens of returning life, the efforts made to revive the torpid energies of Catholics were connected with so many destructive and subversive principles that it seemed problematic which was preferable, the present revival or the former state of inactivity.[1] Putting aside the labors of some distinguished men in attempting to establish unity and harmony among the churches, there was no movement deserving attention during this epoch. *Charles Werner*[2] thus describes the feelings of Catholics and Protestants at this time: "Calixtus," said he, "complained, in closing his irenical address, that there was no chance for peace in Germany as long as Catholic theologians, on the one hand, persisted in refusing to give up papistic theology, and in stigmatizing Protestants as heretics and men forsaken of God; nor, on the other, as long as one-half of the German people were incited against the Catholics by the ceaseless declamation of fanatical preachers, and the Protestant portion would not be persuaded that the evils that afflicted Germany arose out of the unfortunate schism into which the Fatherland had been precipitated by the so-called Reformers. And," he added, "there is no other way of re-

[1] *Schwicker*, The Last Years of the Reign of the Empress Queen Maria Teresa (1763–1780), Prague, 1871, 2 vols.

[2] *Werner*, Hist. of Apologetical and Controversial Literature, Vol. IV., p. 750.

Hosted by Google

storing peace and concord to the Germans except by a return of the Protestants to the unity of Catholic truth." Notwithstanding that the efforts of the princes had failed, in 1644, to restore unity, it was hoped those of *John Philip de Schoenborn*, the prudent Elector of Mentz in 1660, would be more successful. His minister of state, the Baron of *Boyneburg*, a convert, together with the brothers *Walenburch*, *Herman Conring*, and others, encouraged by an invitation, addressed to Catholics and Protestants, by *Matthew Praetorius*, a Protestant, who subsequently entered the Church, calling on them to meet in conference, put forth his best efforts to adjust difficulties and bring about a union.[1]

It was soon apparent that the proposed conditions of union were both indefinite and impracticable. The Catholic Church could never acquiesce in half-measures and partial concessions. There were only two alternatives possible—either to reject *in toto* or accept *in toto the principle of her infallible magisterial authority*. *Christopher Rojas de Spinola*, who was at first appointed Bishop of Tina, in Croatia (from 1688), and afterward transferred to Neustadt, near Vienna († 1695), having been invested by Leopold I. with full power to do what he could toward bringing about a reunion of the churches, again renewed the attempts that had so often failed. Overtures were made to and accepted by the Court of Hanover, in behalf of which *Molanus* (Van der Muelen), Abbot of Lokkum,[2] was

[1] *Matth. Praetorii* tuba pacis ad universas dissidentes in occidente ecclesias seu de unione ecclesiarum romanae et protestantium; Germ. by *Binterim*, 1826. *Walenburch*, Fratres *A.* et *P.* de, Tractatus generalis et specialis de controversiis fidei, Col. 1670, 2 T., f.

[2] Super reunione Protestantium cum eccles. cathol. tractatus inter Jacob. Benign. Bossuetum, episc. Meldens., et Molanum, Abbatem in Lockum. Vienn. Austr. 1783, 4to. (**Prechtl*), Bossuet, Leibnitz, and Molanus in treaty for the reunion of the Catholics and Protestants, Sulzb. 1815. Cf. *Guhrauer*, Biography of Leibnitz. To these attempts also belong Leibnitz's *Systema theologicum*, published in Latin and German, by *Raess* and *Weis*, Mentz, 1820; then by *Lacroix*, Paris, 1845; and again, *in Latin and German, by Dr. *Haas*, Tueb. 1860. This much discussed and greatly overrated production must not be mistaken for an exposition of his private belief (*privata fidei suae expositio*); it being only a statement of the concessions which, in the opinion of *Leibnitz*, Protestants might well make and Catholics accept. Moreover, Leibnitz, though perfectly conscious of the truth, was so far from making open profession of it,

Hosted by Google

commissioned to draw up a plan of union, and *Leibnitz*, who was already in correspondence with *Pélisson* and *Bossuet*[1] on the subject, requested to use his influence for the attainment of the same end. If the efforts of these great men were unsuccessful, they at least made clear to both parties the only possible basis of a union; brought both to understand each other better, and to entertain more kindly feelings; and in this way relieved the Church of many of the charges *falsely* brought against her. A like effect was produced by the compendious but masterly *Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine* by Bossuet, in which, while clearly setting forth the Catholic teaching, he did full justice to the objections and prejudices of the Protestants, proving to them by irrefragable arguments that in separating themselves from the Catholic Church the great bulk of them took the step in ignorance, rather than with a full knowledge of what they were doing.[2] In consequence, many of the German princes, seeing and acknowledging their mistake, to the great joy of Holy Mother Church, returned to the unity of faith. Among these were *Ernest*, Landgrave *of Hesse* (1652); *John Frederic of Brunswick*, then reigning Duke of Hanover (1651); *Frederic Augustus I.*, Elector of Saxony (1697); and *Charles Alexander*, Duke of Würtemberg (1712).

Others again like *Christian Augustus*, Duke of Holstein

that in 1708 he wrote as follows to Fabricius of Helmstaedt: "Our (Hanover's) whole title to the crown of Great Britain rests solely on our rejection and hatred of the religion of Rome. Hence *we must carefully avoid whatever might be construed into connivance by us at the claims of the Roman Catholic Church.*" Cf. the latest discussions on this work in the *Tueb. Quarterly*, 1848, p. 46 sq., and the latest edition of the works of *Leibnitz*, by *Foucher de Careil*, Paris, 1859 sq., T. I., in which there are now to be found 125, instead of the former 36 letters, exchanged by Bossuet and Leibnitz on religious reunion. Cf. *Haffner*, Leibnitz and His Efforts for Reunion in Science, Politics, and Religion. (The "*Catholic*," 1864, Vol. I., p. 513 sq.)

[1] *Bossuet*, Projet de réunion des Protestants de France et d'Allemagne à l'église catholique (Oeuvres; nouv. édit., Par. 1836, T. VII., p. 309–584). Concerning later attempts at reunion, made by *Klüpfel* and *Stattler*, see *Huth*, l. cit., Vol. II., p. 746 sq.

[2] Oeuvres; nouv. édit., T. V., p. 566 et suiv. et Histoire des Variations, 2 vols. in 12mo, Paris, Sarlit.

Hosted by Google

(1705), and the scholarly *Anthony Ulric* (1710) had the great joy of bringing their entire households with them.

But the joy these conversions gave the Church was tinged with sorrow, caused by the spread of the principles of the Hussites and Lutherans in the *territory of Salzburg.*[1] Again, the aggressive spirit of Protestants, on the occasion of the *second centenary celebration* of the outbreak of the Reformation, in the year 1717, was in painful contrast with the irenical temper shown by the noble and gifted men who had made the latest attempts at reunion. Seldom, if ever, had there been such an exhibition of intolerance, provocation, and insult as was then manifested toward Catholics by Protestants of every rank and condition.[2] The acrimonious, fierce, and at times coarse character that marked the controversial writings of *Nicholas Weislinger* († 1755),[3] during the latter years of his life parish priest of Cappel-Rodeck, in the territory of Baden, are in a measure excusable, in that they were used in meeting a still more atrocious method of warfare on the part of Protestants, and were expressive of the indignation the author naturally felt at "*seeing bishops and scholars silent in the face of insults the most stinging and calumnies the most foul.*" One as clever as he in the field of controversy, and as conversant with the writings of the Reformers, might confidently reply to those who reproached him with having written scurrilously, "that the wanton and indecent language and the scandalous blasphemies to be found in his writings were not of his own coinage." "They have," he added, "been extracted from the works of Luther and his partisans, whose words I have uniformly quoted, giving references to where the passages may be had. Seek and you shall find."

A movement antagonistic to the traditional methods of ec-

[1] See below, § 384.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The numerous writings of Weislinger are: "*Friss Vogel oder stirb*"—"*Neck or Nothing,*" 1723, and frequently; *Huttenus delarvatus,* 1730; "Choice Curiosities of Old and New *Theological Quackery,*" 1738; "The *Lutheran Saint Unmasked,*" 1756; Armamentarium Catholicum, 1746; and many more. Cf. *Alzog,* John Nicholas Weislinger, Pastor of Capell, below Rodeck, in the territory of Brisgovia; being an essay to serve for a better acquaintance with his personality and literary activity (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Freiburg, 1865, Vol. I.).

Hosted by Google

clesiastical government, and more or less affecting every branch of ecclesiastical life, began about this time to give tokens of its presence. Its rise may be traced to a number of causes, but among the most potent was the establishment of *papal nunciatures* in *Vienna* (1581), *Cologne* (1582), *Lucerne* (1586), *Brussels* (1588), and *Munich* (1585). These were established for two objects; firstly, to guard the interests of the Church against the dangers of Protestantism; and, secondly, to render ecclesiastical administration more easy and efficient. The bishops regarded the extent of jurisdiction granted to the nuncios of the above cities as a trespass upon their rights, which they determined to defend at every hazard.[1] But on this subject we shall again have occasion to speak.

A still more potent cause of the movement was the influence of French literature, then coming into favor in Germany. The first and most conspicuous evidence of its effects was given in a work by *John Nicholas von Hontheim*, coadjutor Bishop of Treves. Writing under the name of *Justinus Febronius*, he published his book, *On the State of the Church and the Legitimate Authority of the Roman Pontiff*,[2] in which he en-

[1] *A. Menzel* (Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. I., pp. 303 sq.; 2d ed., Vol. VI., pp. 218 sq.) makes some curious disclosures concerning the controversy occasioned by these nunciatures. He says: "Pope *Pius VI.* having requested King William II. of Prussia to protect the papal authority against the encroachments of the Rhenish archbishops, published a comprehensive reply (*Responsio*), laying the state of the controversy with the archbishops before the public, in the course of which he administers to them the following sharp rebuke: 'I am informed,' he says, 'that the extreme corruption prevalent in certain dioceses has become a subject of complaint, and its source is traced to the acts of oppression practiced by the Roman Court. It is a common strategy with schismatics, with a view to imposing upon the inexperienced, to slanderously charge the Apostolic See with moral disorders, the existence of which they can not deny, and then to promise a reformation, forgetful that every reform must begin with one's self. If the nuncios are not hindered in the exercise of their jurisdiction, and the archbishops, as in duty bound, honor and duly obey the First See, and conjointly with the nuncios see to it that the wholesome laws and canons of the Council of Trent be properly enforced, the existing evils will be corrected, even without calling diocesan synods, and the disorders of which the counsellors now complain will disappear from the sees of archbishops and bishops.'"

[2] Justini Febronii de statu eccl. et legitima potestate Rom. Pontif. liber singularis ad reuniendos in relig. christianos compositus, Bouillon, 1763, 4to.

Hosted by Google

deavored to show the Germans by historical arguments that the Gallican Articles were defensible, and that the Pope had no right to interfere in the local discipline and church government of individual dioceses, thus restricting, still more than the Liberties had done, the *essential* jurisdiction of the Holy See. He held that the Pope is in precisely the same relation to the bishops that the presiding officer is to the members of a parliament; that the true constitution of the Church is not *monarchical;* and that the *Church*, and not *Christ*, invested the Bishop of Rome with the Primacy he enjoys. The Pope indeed has *authority*, but not *jurisdiction*, over the Universal Church.

While freely admitting that the Primacy of the Holy See had been established to preserve the unity of the Church, Febronius failed to see that the principles he advanced and the advice he volunteered to the Church and to civil princes necessarily tended to destroy it. So unfair, not to say dishonest, were the constructions put by Febronius upon certain facts of Church history, that *Lessing*,[1] an author not open to the suspicion of partiality, thus comments on his methods: "The opinions of Febronius and his partisans are only a base flattery of princes; the proofs brought forward by him against the rights of the Pope are utterly worthless; or, if they are to be received at all, they tell with double and threefold force against the rights of princes as opposed to those of bishops. This is so evident that nothing could be more so, and I am only astonished that it has never occurred to any one to characterize the opinions of Febronius with the severity they deserve."

John von Mueller, although a Protestant, in his *Journeys of the Popes*, also undertook the vindication of historic truth in this matter. *Hontheim's* writings called forth many refutations, among which may be mentioned those of *Zaccaria*, *Viator de Coccaglia*, *Mamachi*, *Peter Ballerini*, and Professor *Kauffmann*, of Cologne, all remarkable for thorough and

(Frkft. on the Main); German transl., Wardingen, 1764. Cf. *Huth*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 438 sq. *Walch*, Latest Hist. of Religion, Pt. I., p. 145–198. *Otto Mejer*, Supplements to the Romano-German Question, Rostock, 1871.

[1] *Fred. Henry Jacobi*, Complete Works, Vol. II., p. 334.

Hosted by Google

scholarly historical criticism. *Clement XIII.* condemned the book of Febronius, and ordered its suppression by all the bishops of Germany. The author's archbishop besought him to retract the errors it contained, which he did in the year 1778.

Pius VI. expressed the pleasure the retractation gave him in a Consistory of Cardinals,[1] but was soon pained to learn that Hontheim had handed his archbishop an explanation, accompanied with a *Commentary* (1781), both of which went to show that his act of submission had been insincere. The teachings set forth in the *Commentary* had unfortunately a wide and deplorable influence in forming public opinion with regard to the rights of the Holy See. This was especially noticeable in the works of *Valentine Eybel*, a canonist of Vienna; of *Theophorus Ries*, Director of Studies to the Archbishop of Mentz; of the brothers *Riegger;* and even of *Rautenstrauch*, who wrote a childish, servile, and uncatholic tract, entitled, *A Representation to His Holiness*, which the inhabitants of Vienna had the good sense and Catholic instinct to treat with the contempt it deserved.

An effort was made at the same time to prejudice public opinion against *monasticism;* and while its most decided adversaries condemned it outright, the more moderate questioned its usefulness. *Joseph II.*, that paragon of philanthropic enthusiasts, who had always more benevolent designs in his head than he well knew what to do with, desirous of placing the Church under the tutelage of the State, did his best to convert priests into bureaucrats, and civil officers into ecclesiastical judges. In identifying Church and State, his ordinances concerning the former were so Protestant in character "*that*

[1] "Agnovit (*Hontheim*), commentis suis obsistere atque adversari Christi doctrinam, Patrum testimonia, Conciliorum decreta aliasque ecclesiasticas sanctiones. Non temporali commodo illectus, non virium infirmitate fractus, non ingenio debilitatus, nec molestis inductus suasionibus, sed sola veritatis agnitione permotus." Concerning the whole, cf. *Huth*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 438–458. * New elucidations in Gesta Trevirorum, integra lectionum varietate et animadversionibus illustrata ac indice duplici instructa, nunc primum edidit *J. H. Wyttenbach* et *Müller*, Trevir. 1836 sq., T. III., p. 296 sq. Thirteen pieces, cf. "*The Catholic*," 1842, January number, p. 89–93, and Card. *Litta*, quoted above.

Hosted by Google

in effect they virtually amounted to a suspension of the Catholic Church."

To give himself the airs of a liberal Catholic, Joseph II. permitted full liberty of inquiry, and made the *press* nearly, if not quite, *free;* although it was evident that no such thing as *unrestricted* intellectual investigation was possible where both Church and State were in a condition of a degrading servitude. A host of writers at once started up, who set themselves to traduce the Catholic Church and her institutions, and to proclaim that the golden age had dawned. At their head was *Aloysius Blumauer*, who having been expelled from the Society of Jesus, was now an ardent Freemason; *Eybel*, the canonist, and many more, whose intolerably stupid productions brought the calling of *literature* itself into disrepute.

With a view to propagating the *new learning* more rapidly and more effectually, the Emperor had abolished the seminaries in the various dioceses, and in their stead opened five *general* ones in the cities of Vienna, Pesth, Freiburg (1783), Pavia, and Louvain. To these were affiliated the seminaries of Prague, Olmütz, Gratz, Innspruck, and Luxemburg, and the chairs in both were filled by theologians of *enlightenment* and culture. This arrangement, it was said, would more than compensate for the abolition of private institutions, by encouraging, through the relations of the General Seminaries to the Universities, a healthy rivalry in study. To every man of judgment the defect of this plan was apparent, for in withdrawing the seminarists from the eyes of their several bishops, it took from the latter the means of knowing whether or not they possessed either the learning or virtue requisite in aspirants for the priesthood. Joseph II., who carried his interference in ecclesiastical affairs so far as to prescribe the ceremonies for public worship and give instruction in liturgical matters, was facetiously called by Frederic the Great "*My Brother the Sacristan.*" In the year 1783 he published a silly and contemptible ordinance regulating divine worship; and in 1786 prescribed that the German language should be used in the liturgy. He, however, forbore to abolish the celibacy.

Hosted by Google

All these measures were intended to make ecclesiastical discipline a sort of dignified system of police; and when the bishops raised their voices in emphatic protest against such a degradation of a holy thing, he charged them with being both stubborn and stupid.

But that the faith was still deeply seated in the hearts of the people, and that both they and the clergy were warmly attached to the Holy See, was amply attested on the occasion of the visit of *Pius VI.* to Vienna. Their murmurs against the *reformatory* measures, which were steadily clothing them with the vesture of *Protestantism*, though at first muttered only in whispers, grew at last plainly audible, and in Belgium the discontent became so intense that the inhabitants rose in open revolt against the Emperor.

Joseph II. died of a broken heart, February 20, 1790, without having had time to repent of his efforts to crush out the Christian faith in the hearts of his subjects, and to sow in its room the seeds of revolutionary strife. At his last Communion he protested that in all the ordinances he had published during the nine years of his reign, he had always had the welfare of his people in view. By his death he was spared the humiliation of having to revoke the ordinances already published in Belgium. If a General Seminary was not established in this country, the credit is due to the manly and firm stand taken by *Frankenberg*, the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines, who baffled the Emperor's design by the publication of his *Doctrinal Declaration*. The Austrian canonists were guilty of a very grievous fault by pretending to extend the *jus circa sacra* to a *jus in sacra*, thus encouraging Joseph II. in his iniquitous course. He was also encouraged by the Electors of *Mentz*, *Treves*, and *Cologne*, the last of whom was his own brother, the Archduke Maximilian, and by the Archbishop of *Salzburg*, all of whom desired to be independent of Rome, to abolish the papal nunciatures, and to establish a *German National Church.*

At the very time that these bishops were endeavoring to get rid of the Papal Nuncios, *Charles Theodore*, Elector Palatine of Bavaria, owing to the peculiar condition of the Church in his States, was using his efforts to have a nunciature per-

Hosted by Google

manently established at Munich.[1] *Zoglio* was appointed to the position (1785), to whom the Elector ordered the ecclesiastics of his dominions to have recourse in future for all matters within his competency. Even before the arrival of the Nuncio, the bishops addressed a spirited protest to the Pope, which, being unsuccessful, they appealed for aid to Joseph II., who promised to come to their relief (1785). In consequence, the three Electors and the Archbishop of Salzburg came together, forming the notorious *Congress of Ems* (1786), and drew up a *protest in twenty-three articles*, known as the *Punctuation of Ems*,[2] in which they insisted on their absolute and unrestricted episcopal authority, declaring: 1. That as bishops they had no need of consulting Rome; 2. That they of their own authority might dispense in matrimonial impediments to the second degree; 3. That all bulls and briefs emanating from the Holy See might or might not be accepted by bishops, according to their judgment; 4. That the revenues of the pallium and annates should be abolished, and a reasonable tax levied instead; 5. That for disposing of cases of appeal the Pope should appoint delegate judges (*judices in partibus*), or establish a provincial synod; and 6. That bishops, having been again restored to their primitive rights, should have power to introduce improvements in ecclesiastical discipline.[3]

The *Punctuation* was sent to Joseph II., who gave it his hearty approval, adding that there was no question but that the issue would be ultimately successful, if only the *bishops*

[1] Pragmatic History of the Nunciature at Munich, Frkft. 1787. *Aquilin Caesar*, History of the Nunciatures in Germany, 1790. *Huth*, l. cit., Vol. II., p. 468–490; and *Buss*, Authentic History of National and Territorial Churchdom in Germany, Schaffhausen, 1851, p. 736; *Marx*, Hist. of Treves.

[2] Conf. *Huth*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 491–500. See the Reports of the Congress in *Buss*, l. c., p. 738 sq.; in *Münch's* Collection of Old and New Concordats, Pt. I., p. 404–423. The Congress of Ems, according to Authentic Documents, Frkft. and Lps. 1787, 4to. *Pacca*, Historical Reminiscences of His Sojourn in Germany, 1786–1794; Germ., Augsburg, 1832, in the Appendix on Nuncios, together with historical documents, p. 145–215. *Walch*, Latest Hist. of Religion, Pt. I., p. 337–388.

[3] But how little these improvements were to be expected was evident from the Fawns and Satyrs which figured so conspicuously in the decorations of the episcopal palaces in Würzburg, Mentz, and Bühl, near Bonn.

Hosted by Google

could be brought to share the sentiments of the *archbishops* on the questions involved. Of this, however, there was no reasonable possibility; on the contrary, the Bishop of Spire at once told the Elector of Mentz that many of the articles of the *Punctuation* must be rejected, and that, in his opinion, it was utterly impossible to strip the Holy See of rights it had indisputably exercised for above a thousand years. His example was followed by the Bishop of Würzburg, a brother of the Elector of Mentz, and by many more, who gave notable evidence of their loyalty to the Holy See when *Pacca*, the Papal Nuncio, published a circular letter, addressed to all priests having care of souls, warning them that the archbishops had no jurisdiction to grant dispensations reserved to the Holy See, and that if such were granted they would be null and void. This caused the Elector of Treves to waver, and in 1787 he petitioned the Pope for faculties for the diocese of Augsburg, to hold good for five years. The Elector of Mentz was the next to make advances, requesting the Holy See to confirm the appointment of *Baron de Dalberg* as his coadjutor. Finally, the three Electors together disavowed their former action, declaring that they had nothing more at heart than the settlement of the unfortunate differences between themselves and the Holy See, and acknowledging its right to send nuncios to Germany and to grant dispensations (1789). In reply, Pope Pius VI., after congratulating them on their change of mind, gave a firm, but temperate statement of the grounds on which his rights were based. The letter is a masterpiece of its kind.[1]

§ 371. *Literary Activity—Unbelief—Superstition.*

Thesaurus librorum rei Catholicae, Würzburg, 1848, 2 vols. *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theology since the Council of Trent (especially in Germany).

These ecclesiastico-political events, as has been already remarked, had a deep influence on general literature and theological studies. Down to the middle of the eighteenth cen-

[1] Sanctissimi Dom. nostri Pii Papae VI. responsio ad Metropolitanos Moguntinum, Trevirens., Colon. et Salisb. super Nuntiaturis Apostol., Rom. 1789.

Hosted by Google

tury, German writers on theology confined their labors to its two leading branches, viz: *Scholastic Theology* and *Canon Law*. The questions in dispute between the Thomists and Scotists were mainly discussed by the two rival schools of the Benedictines and Jesuits. *Patrick Sporer*, a Franciscan († 1681),[1] and particularly *James Busenbaum*, a Jesuit († 1668),[2] introduced an important change in the study of Canon Law by separating from it what properly belonged to the domain of Moral Theology. A similar change took place in dogmatics. Scholastic theology was *simplified* by being cleared of its elaborate system of formulas, its endless distinctions, and refined subtleties. These tendencies were pushed still further by *Eusebius Amort*,[3] a canon regular of St. Augustine († 1775), who, standing, as it were, on the boundary that marked the decline of Speculative Scholasticism and the rise of modern positive theology, is the most important author of that age.[4] With a view to give to theological studies a wider range, and to better adapt them to the needs of the times, special attention was given to institutions where the higher branches of theology were cultivated. This solicitude was all the more necessary now that the suppression of the Society of Jesus, whose members had filled nearly all the faculties of theology, rendered important reforms imperative. The first movement

[1] The following biographical notices of celebrated moralists have been taken from *M. Haringer*, C. SS. R., Index Scriptorum: **Sporer*, Patritius, Germanus, Passaviensis, Ord. St. Francisci, definitor sui ordinis. St. Alphonsus says of him, that in his decisions he was very fair, and, perhaps, sometimes rather too mild. (Tr.) His work was entitled Theologia moralis super decalogum.

[2] *Busenbaum*, Hermannus, Germanus, S. J., rector collegii Hildesiensis. Medulla theologiae moralis, of which there appeared forty-five editions, from 1645–1670.

[3] *Amort*, Eusebius, Germanus, canonicus regularis Pollingae et S. Joannis Lateranensis; theologus episc. Augustani, a S. Alphonso saepius laudatus ut vir pro suis variis operibus undequaque perspectus. Suam theologiam moralem et scholasticam non nisi prius a Benedicto XIV. recognitam typis mandavit. Egregie defendit probabilismum, sed in quaestionibus practicis multo severior quam S. Alphonsus extitit. Tr. fr. *Ballerini's* Index Scriptorum, ed. Rom. 1869, p. XII. His work, Theologia moralis et scholastica, Augustae Vindelicor., 1752 sq., 23 T., 8vo.

[4] Cf. Thesaurus libror. catholicor., Vol. I., p. 13, 14, and *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theol., p. 96–174, and many other places.

Hosted by Google

toward widening the range of theological studies was made in Austria during the reign of *Maria Teresa*, on the secret advice of *Van Switen*; and it was at once noticeable that the movement was accompanied by an uncatholic spirit and a tendency hostile to the rights of the Church, both of which the Jesuits strenuously opposed until the day of their suppression.

At the earnest solicitation of *Trautson*, Archbishop of Vienna, and *Ambrose Stock*, one of his suffragan bishops, the Austrian government included, among the branches of the theological curriculum, the *interpretation of Holy Scripture* according to the original Hebrew and Greek texts.

Under *Rautenstrauch*, Abbot of Braunau, and from 1774 Rector of the Theological Faculty of the University of Vienna, special chairs were founded for *Biblical Exegetics* and its cognate branches, and also for *Church History*, *Patrology*, and *Pastoral Theology*, and to this day the same plan of studies is observed. Unfortunately, the direction of the whole course of studies was committed by Joseph II. to Baron *Godfrey van Switen*, who was in active correspondence with the French and German philosophers of that age, and particularly with those of Berlin and the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht. Through his influence and by his authority, the pretentious and superficial acquirements, which were regarded as essential to what was called enlightenment, were made to form part of the new course of theological studies, and soon became fashionable in the *General Seminaries*, from which, being establishments of the government, all episcopal interference was excluded.[1] From Prague and Vienna this spirit of rationalism and false enlightenment spread to the universities and seminaries in other cities, everywhere infecting the faculties of philosophy and theology. The professors, discarding the philosophy of Aristotle, constructed their systems of dogmatic and moral theology on that of Kant and Fichte. The theological faculty of *Freiburg*, under Dannenmayer, Klüpfel, and Wanker (from 1788); that of *Würzburg*, under *Oberthür*,

[1] Cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., pp. 1023–1046; Fr. trans., Vol. 25, art. "Vienne."

Hosted by Google

Onymus, *Francis Berg*,[1] and Barthel; that of Ingolstadt, and, still later, those of Dillingen and Landshut, all gave evidence of extraordinary literary activity, which was, *in a measure at least*, inspired by excellent motives. At *Treves*, the hot-bed of Febronianism, and at *Mentz*, *Heidelberg*, and *Bonn*,[2] a spirit of rationalism, leading straight to Protestantism, and having other tendencies equally dangerous and destructive, was openly and defiantly avowed. *Baron* Charles of *Erthal*, the last Elector of Mentz, suffered himself to be completely converted to this rationalistic and spurious enlightenment by the fulsome flattery that was skillfully lavished upon him, and in his zeal to promote its advancement endeavored to reform the university of that city by filling its professorships with men, whether Protestant or Catholic, known to be favorable to the new learning. His brother, *Francis Louis of Erthal*, Prince Bishop of Würzburg, who was incomparably his superior in both prudence and virtue, labored in vain to dissuade him from his rash purpose. Orthodoxy was daily losing ground, and it was not long until rationalism was completely triumphant.

Affairs were in a still more deplorable condition at the Academy of *Bonn*, which the brother of Joseph II., *Maximilian Francis*, Archbishop Elector, acting under the advice of

[1] *Schwab*, Francis Berg, Ecclesiastical Counsellor and Professor of Ch. H. at the University of Würzburg, being a Supplement to the Age of Enlightenment, Würzburg, 1869 (a carefully written and instructive monography).

[2] †*Brück*, The Rationalistic Tendencies in Catholic Germany, especially in the Three Rhenish Archbishoprics during the second half of the Eighteenth Century, Mentz, 1865. Among others the physiologist, *Rudolph Wagner*, gives a curious account of the policy of the Court of Mentz toward the close of the last century. The leaders of the intellectual movement were the Elector Frederic Charles; Dalberg, his coadjutor; and the powerful minister Albani. It was indeed a most peculiar age, when an ecclesiastical elector could invite a number of Protestants to the university of his capital, one of whom he made his confidant and sent to Rome, the center of Catholic Christendom, on a mission to the Holy Father. There was also quite a brilliant galaxy of influential ladies at this court, all of whom interested themselves, after their own fashion, in promoting literature and art. It was at this time that Heinse read his Ardinghello to the Elector and Madame de Coudenhofen. (*Rudolph Wagner*, Biography of Samuel von Soemmering, Professor of Anatomy at Cassel, and afterward at Mentz; died 1830 at Frankfort.)

Hosted by Google

the Illuminati, raised in 1786 to the rank of a university, that it might counteract the influence of the University of Cologne. One of the professors at this seat of learning, who received his appointment in the face of numerous protests, was *Eulogius Schneider*, who as a student had been expelled from Würzburg for immoral conduct. He was a thorough Socinian, weak and inconstant in character, an advocate of the religion of nature, and a fanatical revolutionist. After assisting in carting the guillotine around from place to place to chop off other people's heads, he ended by having his own taken off with the same instrument of death at Strasburg, April 10, 1794. When such influences were at work it is not surprising that the new method of learning, dominated as it was by utilitarian principles, produced a theology hostile in many respects to the spirit of the Church, and in no way remarkable for originality of thought or intellectual excellence. The best works produced in the domain of *dogmatics* were those of the Jesuit, *Benedict Stattler*,[1] of Ingolstadt, and the Augustinian, *Engelbert Klüpfel*,[2] a professor at Freiburg. The former, who was a deep and acute thinker, treated the subject more or less in detail; the latter published only a compendium. *Michael Sailer*, a man equally eminent for ability and virtue, rendered the following tribute to the memory of Stattler: "At this time," he says, "there appeared in Germany a man who taught us to think for ourselves, and, starting with the most elementary propositions of philosophy, to rigorously follow out the line of thought they opened up to its last conclusions in theology. To him, as in gratitude bound, myself and many more ascribe whatever of ability we possess to think independently, and without being unduly influenced by the opinions of others." The theological teachings of Stattler, however, were not entirely above suspicion,

[1] *Stattler*, Demonstratio evangelica, Aug. Vind. 1771; Demonstratio cath., Pappenh. 1775; Theologia christ. theoretica, Ingolst. 1776, VI. T.; General Doctrine of the Catholic Religion, Munich, 1793, 2 vols.

[2] *E. Klüpfel*, Institutt. theol. dogm. II. T., Vindob. 1789, ed. III. auctore Greg. Thom. Ziegler, Vien. 1821. Vinc. Lerin. commonitor., ed. Klüpfel, Vien. 1809. Bibliotheca ecclesiastica Friburgensis, fr. 1775–90 (Theological Review). Cf. *Hug*, Elogium Eng. Klüpfelii, Frib. 1811.

Hosted by Google

many of his most important works having been censured by the Holy See.[1] As to Klüpfel, his works have been in constant use in Austria down to our own day, and this fact alone is a sufficient guarantee of their merit. The same may be said of the larger and smaller dogmatical works of the Cistercian, *Wiest*, both of which are clearly written, and give evidence of an intimate knowledge of the subject in hand. He also wrote on patrology and on the history of Christian literature. The large and valuable work of the Dominican, *Gazzaniga*,[2] a professor at Vienna, and the apologetical works of *Beda Mayr*, and *Storchenau* were all well received. The works of the learned and eminent *Martin Gerbert*,[3] Abbot of the Benedictine monastery at St. Blaise, in the Black Forest, treating chiefly of the *method* of studying theology, are deservedly held in high esteem († 1743). The inmates of St. Blaise continued to be distinguished for their scholarship and varied learning, even after the period of secularization, counting among their number such eminent men as Ussermann, Herrgott, and Neutgart. *Moral theology*, which had been treated too much after the manner of casuits by the Jesuits, *Busenbaum*, *Lacroix*, and *Voit*, not to speak of others, was now presented in a more direct and simple form by *Joseph Lauber*,[4] of Vienna, and *Augustine Zippe*,[5] of Prague. Their

[1] Particularly the Demonstratio Catholica and Theologia Christiana theoretica. Cf. *Huth*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 434 and 454.

[2] *Wiest*, Institutiones (majores) theol., Ingolst. 1790–1801, 6 T. Institut. theolog. dogmat. in *usum academ.*, 2 T., 1791, and often. Introductio in historiam literariam theologiae revelatae, Ingolst. 1794; institutiones Patrologiae, ibid. 1795. *Gazzaniga*, praelectt. theol., 5 T., Vien. 1775.

[3] Apparatus ad eruditionem theologicam, institutioni tironum congregationis St. Blasii, Frib. 1754; principia theologiae *exegeticae*, St. Blas. 1757; de recto et perverso usu theologiae scholasticae, St. Blas. 1758; principia theol. *dogmaticae* juxta seriem temporum et traditionis ecclesiasticae digesta, St. Blas. 1758; principia theol. *symbolicae*, ubi ordine symboli apostolici praecipua doctrinae chr. capita explicantur, St. Blas. 1758, etc. Other principal works: Historia nigrae silvae, St. Blas. 1783, 3 T., 4to; De musica sacra, St. Blas. 1774. Cf. *Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theology, p. 179–192.

[4] *J. Lauber*, A Short Manual of Christian Morality or Moral Theology, 5 pts., Vienna, 1785–1788.

[5] *A. Zippe*, A Key to a System of Ethics in accordance with Reason and Revelation, intended for the Private Instruction of Youth, Prague, 1778.

Hosted by Google

treatment, however, was also unsatisfactory, in that by eliminating dogmatic principles, which are necessarily the groundwork of all moral theology, they gave to their otherwise meritorious works an appearance of shallowness and want of solidity. *Stattler*,[1] *Schwarzhueber*, and *Danzer* were each superior to both of them, though in the writings of every one of these authors there is a noticeable absence of that high ethical standard which should characterize the works of every writer on Christian morality. They had a special fondness for introducing into their works the purely philosophical ideas of ancient and modern authors, which they adjusted as best they could to the principles of Christian ethics, and out of these two incongruous elements attempted to build up a system of morals in harmony at once with the tastes of the age and the requirements of the Church.

F. Christian Pitroff,[2] of Prague; *Giftschütz*, of Vienna; *Schwarzel*,[3] of Freiburg; and *Francis Geiger*,[4] a Bavarian, published works on Pastoral Theology. A religious and truly Catholic spirit was fostered *among the people* by the writings of the Jesuit, *Nakatenus* (*Heavenly Palm Grove*, also in Latin, *Coeleste Palmetum*, 1660); of the Premonstratensian, *Leonard Goffine*, who dwelt on the banks of the Lower Rhine (*Hand-Postil*, 1690, †1719); and of the Capuchin, *Martin Cochem*, whose simple manners and dignified bearing won the confidence and commanded the respect of all who approached him. He dwelt on the banks of the Moselle, and died in the year 1712.

---

[1] *Stattler*, Ethica Christ. universalis et ethica Christ. communis, VI. T., Aug. Vind. 1782–1789. Complete Treatise on Christian Morals, for the Use of Families, Augsburg, 1789 sq. Catholic Ethics, or the Science of Happiness, based on Revelation and Philosophy, destined for the Higher Classes in Lyceums, Munich, 1791, 2 vols. *Schwarzhueber*, Practical Manual of the Catholic Religion, intended for reflecting Christians, Salzburg (1786), 1797 sq., 4 vols. *Danzer*, A Guide to Christian Morality, Salzburg (1787), 3d edit., 1792–1803, 3 vols.

[2] *Pittroff*, Lessons of Practical Divinity, for the use of Academies, Prague, 1778–1779, 3 vols. Ecclesiastical Policy, Prague, 1785, 2 vols.

[3] *F. Giftschütz*, Elements of Pastoral Theology, 2 vols., Vienna, 1785; Lat. by *Klüpfel*, Vienna, 1789. *Schwarzel*, A Key to a Complete System of Pastoral Theology, Augsburg, 1799, 1800, 3 vols.

[4] *F. Geiger*, Pastoral Lessons on the Duties of a Parish Priest, Augsb. 1789.

Hosted by Google

Abraham-a-Sancta-Clara (Ulrich Megerle),[1] an Augustinian, was a man of great originality of thought, extensive information, grotesque humor, never-failing wit, and homely, though vigorous language; and, after his appointment as court preacher at Vienna, lashed the follies of all classes of society with commendable freedom and admirable intrepidity. Of the numerous writers on ecclesiastical history it will suffice to mention *Pohl*, a Jesuit, and *Stoeger*, both of Vienna; *Gaspar Royko*, of Prague; and *Dannenmayr*, a professor at Freiburg, and afterward at Vienna. The collections of German councils by *Schannat*, *Harzheim*, and others; the *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, published in six volumes, folio, at Augsburg in 1521; and the works of *Bernard Pez*, a Benedictine of the monastery of Melk, were all valuable contributions to Church history. The last named author was assisted in his labors by his younger brother, *Jerome Pez*, whose edition of the *Scriptores rerum Austriacarum*, published in three volumes, folio, at Leipsig in 1721, made him famous. The compilation of the results of the labors performed by the members of the French Congregation of St. Maur in patristic studies has a merit peculiarly its own. It was accomplished by the Benedictine, *Dominic Schramm*, of Banz (*Analysis Patrum*, as far as St. Augustine, 18 vols., 8vo); *Placidus Sprenger*, of Würzburg (*Thesaurus rei patristicae seu Dissertationes praestantiores*, etc., 3 vols, 4to); and by *Bernard Marschall* and *Godfrey Lumper*, of St. George's, near Villingen. Of the two last the former was the author of a *Concordia Ss. Patrum eccles. Graec. et Latin.*, 2 vols., folio; and the latter of a *Historia theologica de vita et scriptis Ss. Patrum*, 13 vols., octavo. The first, though rather unsuccessful attempt at writing a patrology, was made by *Wilhelm*, a professor at Freiburg (*Patrologia in usus academicos*, 1775). There were numerous writers on *Canon Law*, all of whom, in the treatment of the subject, pursued the *traditional* methods. The following are the more eminent: *Engel*, a Benedictine, of Salzburg (*Collegium universi juris canonici*, Salisb. 1671, ed. XV., 1770, 3 vols.); *Pirhing* (*Jus canonicum*, Dilling. 1675, 5 vols., fol., ed. nov., Venet.

[1] *Th. G., of Karajan*, Abraham-a-Santa-Clara, Vienna, 1867.

Hosted by Google

1727, fol.); *Anacletus Reiffenstuel*, O. S. F. Minor. (*Jus canonicum universum juxta titulos librorum V. decretalium*, Monachii, 1702; Romae, 1831, 6 vols.); *James Wiestner* (*Institut. canon. sive jus. eccl. ad Decret. Gregor. IX. libros quinque*, Monachii, 1705, 5 vols., 4to); *Fr. Schmier* (*Jurisprudentia canonico-civilis seu Jus canonicum universum juxta libros V. Decret.*, Salisb. 1716, 3 vols.); the Jesuits, *Fr. Schmalzgrueber* (*Jus eccles. universale*, Ingolst. 1726, 5 vols., fol.; Romae, 1843, 12 bindings, 4to); *Biner* (*Apparatus eruditionis ad jurisprudentiam praesertim eccles.*, 1754, etc., 13 T., 4to); the Piarist, *Remigius Maschat* (new edit., Florence, 1854, 4 vols., with a *Gallican* tendency); *Bern. van Espen* (*Jus eccl. univ.*, Colon. Agripp. 1702, fol.; Mogunt. 1791, 3 vols.); *Greg. Zallwein*, in a Gallican *Josephist*, but still moderate spirit (*Principia juris eccles. univ. et particularis Germaniae*, 1763, 4 T., 4to; Aug. Vind. 1781, 5 vols., 4to; 1831, 5 vols.); and *Gaspar Barthel*, the Würzburg Canonist.

As time went on it became clear that the true Catholic spirit was gradually but steadily dying out, and that the negative influence of Protestantism was beginning to appear in the writings of many of the Catholic theologians. *Blau*, a professor of theology at Mentz, went so far as to call in question the infallibility of the representatives of the Church assembled in general council.[1] *Lawrence Isenbiehl*,[2] of Eichsfeld, who had been sent by Emmerich Joseph, Elector of Mentz, to Goettingen to complete his studies in Oriental literature, expressed his doubts as to the Messianic prophecy of Isaias vii. 14, denying that it contained any reference to the Messiah. His opinions were submitted to the judgment of many of the theological faculties, and returned with notes of censure attached; and his *New Essay on the Prophecy concerning Emmanuel*, which appeared without either the printer's name or the required legal authorization, was condemned by Pope Pius VI. (September 2, 1779) as containing doctrines and propositions erroneous, rash, dangerous, favoring heresy,

[1] Critical History on Ecclesiastical Infallibility, to Serve as an Aid for a Freer Investigation of Catholicism, Frkft. 1791.

[2] Cf. *Huth*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 358-369. *Walch*, l. c., Pt. VIII., p. 9-88.

Hosted by Google

and even heretical. Isenbiehl, who had been in the first instance treated with unnecessary severity, now retracted his errors, and was appointed by his archbishop to a benefice at Amoeneburg.

Steinbühler, a jurist of Strasburg, ridiculed the ceremonies of the Church, but his blasphemous utterances were dearly expiated by the persecution he underwent (1781). The extreme of atheistic free thought was reached in the principles professed by the *Order of the Illuminati*,[1] already mentioned. It was founded May 1, 1776, by *Weishaupt*, a professor of canon law at Ingolstadt. Its members were told that after having passed through the degrees of *Magus* and *Rex*, or priest and regent, they would arrive at the full light of knowledge. The Illuminism of Weishaupt was a mixture of French atheism and German freemasonry, and its aim "the abolition of priestcraft and knavery and the extermination of the wicked (that is, of priests and princes) from the face of the earth." The Illuminati endeavored to have men in full sympathy with them put into every position of trust in both Church and State. They aimed at giving priests to the altar, counsellors to princes, professors to universities, and commanders to the fortresses of the Empire.[2]

Nicolai and *Biester*, of Berlin, and their co-laborers in the preparation of the *German Universal Library*, were the next to propagate the principles and spread the Order of the Illuminati. The government of Bavaria, after inquiring into the character and methods of the new organization, ordered its suppression in 1784. It, however, continued to exist and to extend the scope of its pernicious influence. As an illustration of the saying that extremes meet, nearly simultaneously with the Illuminati, *Gassner*,[3] the parish-priest at Ellwangen,

[1] On the Order of the Illuminati in Germany, 1792. Some Original Writings of the Order of the Illuminati, by order of the supreme authority, Munich, 1787. *Weishaupt*, The Improved System of the Illuminati, with all its Grades and Institutions, Frkft. 1788. (*Weishaupt*, Hist. of the Persecution of the Illuminati, Frkft. and Lps. 1786.)

[2] Concerning the efforts of the German frecthinkers, now kept in check, see the remarkable memorial by *Gfroerer* (Review of Historical Theology, edited by *Illgen*, Vol. VI., Lps. 1836).

[3] *Huth*, l. c., Vol. VII., pp. 388–397. *Walch*, Pt. VI., pp. 364 sq.

Hosted by Google

became famous in the year 1774 for his powers of exorcism and his gift of healing all manner of diseases in the name of Jesus. From all parts of Germany Protestants and Catholics came crowding about him to receive of such benefits as he had to impart, but as a rule returned home heartily ashamed of their credulity, and as sick and infirm as they were before seeing him. *Jerome* of *Coloredo*, Archbishop of Salzburg, issued a charge to his flock, condemning these pretended cures, in the course of which he said: "An attempt has been made in our day to introduce a new method of healing diseases, which, whether in principle or in practice, no child of the Church can regard as other than dangerous and worthy of condemnation." Gassner's conduct was also censured by both the Emperor and the Pope.

§ 372. *Political and Religious Disturbances in Poland.*

Friese, Ch. H. of Poland, Pt. II., Vol. II. *Huth*, l. cit., Vol. II., p. 233–241. *Walch*, New Hist. of Religion, Vol. IV., p. 1–208; Vol. VII., p. 3–160.

In no country had *Dissenters*, from whatever religious party they came, been so freely received and so generously tolerated as in Poland. By concessions granted successively in the years 1569, 1573, 1576, and 1587, their rights were augmented, their prerogatives extended, and their liberties widened.[1] Their pretensions increased as their liberties grew, and once in possession of the latter, they assumed toward Catholics a bearing of superiority strangely contrasting with the humbleness of their origin and the disabilities of their former condition. The consequence was that a decided reaction set in against them on the part of Catholics, beginning with the reign of Sigismund III.

By decrees of the Diets held in 1717 and 1733, numerous restrictions were put upon the civil and religious freedom they had formerly enjoyed, and the Consistory of Posen (1743) forbade Lutheran ministers to either baptize or instruct children born of mixed marriages. These measures were provoked by

[1] *Jus dissidentium* in regno Poloniae. Scrutinium juris in re et ad rem theologico juridicum, Vars. 1736, f., p. 192–256.

Hosted by Google

the action of the Lutheran magistracy of the Protestant city of *Thorn*, which had repeatedly denied to its Catholic inhabitants rights to which they were plainly and justly entitled, and had declined to pay any attention to their lawful petitions. The long pent-up anger of both parties finally broke out into open violence on the 10th of July, 1724, when a mob, after dispersing a Catholic procession, proceeded to pull down the college of the Jesuits.[1] The affair was investigated, and *Roesner*, the burgomaster; *Zernike*, the vice-president; and nine burghers were condemned, and, despite the intercession of *Santini*, the Papal Nuncio, with King Augustus at Warsaw, all, with the exception of Zernike, executed. The Diet of Pacification, convoked in 1736, to provide measures for the public safety, seriously threatened by the Dissidents, gave them the fullest assurances of peace, secured them in their possessions, and confirmed their claims to equal civil rights, only forbidding them to hold political assemblies or invoke the aid of foreign princes. In defiance of this prohibition, two Lithuanians, the brothers *Grabowski*, and two Poles, the brothers *Golz*, made an offer of the crown of Poland to *Frederic Christian, Elector of Saxony*. After his death, however, they deemed it more advantageous to join the Russo-Prussian party, lately formed in Poland.

Taught by costly experience, the Diet of 1766, in which *Ladislaus Lubienski*, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, delivered a speech remarkable for energy and power, confirmed all the general laws enacted against the Dissidents in the years 1717, 1733, 1736, and 1747. Both Russia and Prussia, yielding to the frequent and urgent solicitations of the Dissidents, seized upon this action of the Diet as a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of Poland. They also endeavored to make the Courts of France and Sweden partners to their design.[2] From the 15th of October, 1767, the influence of Russian despotism was supreme in the Diet of

[1] (*Jablonski*), The Troubles of Thorn, Berlin, 1725. Cf. Chronicle of Thorn, *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol X., p. 953–957; Fr. tr., Vol. 23, p. 417 sq.

[2] Cf. *Janssen*, Supplements serving to elucidate the causes that contributed to the first partition of Poland, Freiburg, 1865. The author states, on page 184, "that Bishop *Soltik* had warned the Dissidents against this step, saying that

Hosted by Google

Warsaw. All orators, whether Catholics or Dissidents, who displayed any zeal in opposing the policy of Russia, were seized and carried off prisoners to that country; and Poland, acting from motives of fear rather than from the dictates of wisdom, concluded a treaty with the government of the Tsar, by which, while the Catholic was to be the religion of the State, and professed by the king, the Dissidents were to have all the religious and civil rights enjoyed in the year 1717 restored to them. The Diet of 1786 went still further, extending the rights of Protestants, restricting those of Catholics, and interfering generally in purely ecclesiastical affairs.

The bishops having applied to the Holy See for instructions regarding the questions arising out of marriages between Catholics and Dissidents and Catholics and separated Greeks, received in reply from *Benedict XIV.* the bull *Magnae nobis admirationis*, setting forth that such marriages could not be permitted, except on certain conditions, one of which was that all children born of them should be brought up in the Catholic faith. The Diet, on the other hand, decided "that such marriages should not be hindered by any one whomsoever; that the marriage blessing should be given in all cases by the minister of the religion professed by the bride; and that of the offspring of such unions the male children should be brought up in the religion of the father and the female in that of the mother."

The Papal Nuncio, *Maria Durini*, having arrived while these events were in progress, sent to the royal chancellor an instrument containing the rights reserved to the Holy See, a copy of which he also sent to the Polish clergy. Stanislaus also received a message from Pope *Clement XIII.*, complaining of the illegal proceedings of the Diet, but King *Stanislaus* excused himself by saying that, inasmuch as the claims of the Dissidents were supported by the influence of a great power, he felt himself constrained to yield. "Every means," said he, "was tried to resist the demand of which you complain; but so threatening was the storm evoked by the indiscretion

foreign powers used *religious questions* only as a pretext, their real design being to kindle the flames of civil war in Poland, and thus divide the country."

Hosted by Google

of certain nobles that we regarded it a special fortune to be able to gain the nearest port. Any further attempt to hold out against the tyranny of the North will henceforth be both useless and fatal." The clergy, more courageous than their sovereign, protested against the action of the Diet, particularly in regard to mixed provisions, declaring that, notwithstanding the signatures of many of the bishops affixed to its enactments, they would continue to regard such marriages as not binding, according to the laws of the Church, and that the bishops holding their seats in the Diet as *laymen* had no authority in the matter. In consequence the Consistory of Posen published a circular letter, denying the binding force of the enactments of the Diet; and the bishops, after having sent several communications on the subject to *Clement XIV.*, finally received a reply from Pope *Pius VI.*, in 1777, stating that they were to observe the instructions of Benedict XIV.

The *Dissenters*, in their efforts to carry out their extravagant notions of their own rights, had brought their country to the verge of ruin. All Poland saw with sorrow, when it was too late to correct the mistake, that the country was inevitably passing under the yoke of Russia, and the authors of her disasters were held up to everlasting execration. The *Confederation of Bar* was formed with a view to withdrawing Poland from the all-powerful influence of Russia, but no efforts could prevent the perpetration of that stupendous national wrong known as the *First Partition of Poland* in 1772. This event so exasperated the nation that, by the constitution of 1775, all Dissidents were declared incapable of holding offices of public trust and honor. To strengthen themselves, the Lutherans and Calvinists held a joint assembly at Lissa in the same year. Finally, the Polish nobles quarreled among themselves as to whether they should or not accept the new constitution of May 3, 1791, giving political rights to the cities, civil rights to the peasantry, and making the kingly authority hereditary; and, after once more bringing innumerable disasters upon their unhappy country, again afforded Russia

Hosted by Google

and Prussia a pretext for the *Second Partition of Poland* in 1793.[1]

The gallant *Kosciusko*, at the head of a brave army, made a noble but fruitless resistance against the combined forces of Russia and Prussia.[2] He was overcome by numbers. A general uprising took place in 1794; the Prussians were forced to retreat to their own country, and the Russians were several times routed. But Austria, which had had no hand in the Second Partition, came forward now; the Russians and Prussians again rallied; Kosciusko, at the head of the last patriot army, was defeated; Praga was sacked; Warsaw captured; the Polish monarchy annihilated; and, by the *Third Partition*, in 1795, Poland was completely dismembered, and its name erased from the catalogue of nations. Her king, *Stanislaus Poniatowski*, submitted to be a pensioner on the bounty of Russia, and died broken-hearted at St. Petersburg in 1798. And thus perished the great Polish Empire, which at one time comprised twenty-seven millions of souls, and had so long formed the bulwark of Christendom against the assaults of the Turks, and civilized Europe against the Mongolian hordes of Russia.

§ 373. *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus.*

* *Riffel*, Suppression of the Society of Jesus, being an inquiry into the accusations, both old and new, against it, Mentz (1845), 1848. *Crétineau-Joly*, Vol. V. Against him, *Theiner*, Hist. of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., Lps. 1853, Pt. II. Against *Theiner*, *Buss*, The Society of Jesus, Pt. II., p. 1262 sq. *De Ravignan*, Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., Paris, 1854, and the Suppression of the Society of Jesus, Paris and Augsburg, 1854. The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions, by Rev. *Alfred Weld*, S. J., London, 1877. (Tr.)

In tracing the history of the Church in the various coun-

[1] The opposition of the nobility was caused by the intrigues, influence, and money of Catharine of Russia. Only *five* out of two hundred thousand representatives of the Polish nation signed the document of *Targowitz*, sent to Russia as a protest against the constitution. (Tr.)

[2] It should be borne in mind that Prussia had encouraged Poland to proclaim the constitution of 1791, and that her king, Frederic William, had *sworn* to defend the Poles against Russia. But if she had not proved a traitor to her national honor, her history would have been wanting in consistency. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

tries of Europe, we come upon facts that seem to prove that the Society of Jesus, which had been so active and useful in the preceding epoch, had lost somewhat of its primitive virtue and power, or had ceased to exert its energies within the scope originally designed by its founders. *Portugal* took the initial steps in the persecution of the Jesuits.[1] By a treaty, concluded in 1750, Portugal restored to Spain the rich colony of *San Sagramento* in exchange for seven Reductions of Paraguay, which had been so prosperous under the admirable government of the Jesuits. This treaty necessitated the removal of thirty thousand Indians from their happy homes. The Jesuits, acting in obedience to the king's orders, did their best to persuade these poor people to obey, but to no purpose.[2] From sheer desperation they rose in open revolt against the Portuguese. The Jesuits were accused of having incited them to rebellion, and of having established for their own aggrandizement a republic in the Province of Maranhão of a character *never before heard of.* This persecution was mainly, if not altogether, the work of *Pombal*, the Minister of *Joseph Emmanuel I.*, and of the canonist, *Pereira.* Whatever may have been the motives of the latter, the former certainly acted from a diabolical hatred of men who would not consent to be his tools, and from the lust of gold in which it was supposed the Reductions abounded. He also made a conspiracy against the life of the king, in which he endeavored to implicate some of their number, a pretext for fierce denunciations against them. Ten of them were put on trial, and although, in spite of the notorious unfairness of the court, nothing could be proved which in any way made them partners to the attempt upon the king's life, they were banished from Portugal and from the Portuguese dominions in both East and West, and after enduring atrocities, the very recital of which makes the blood boil, were set down on the docks of Cività Vecchia, in the Papal States, in the year 1759, when the Decree of Expulsion was published, and in

[1] *Murr*, Hist. of the Jesuits in Portugal under Pombal, Nürnberg, 1787, 2 vols.

[2] *Weld*, Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions, London, 1877. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

the following years, to be cared for as best they might.[1] Their goods were confiscated, and those who had not been deported were left to languish in frightful dungeons until the death of the king, in 1777, when his daughter *Maria* gave them their freedom.

In France the Jansenists, the Encyclopaedists, and the parliament all conspired together to compass the ruin of the Jesuits. The Society had not been able to establish itself in Paris until 1550, under Henry II., and even then against the will and in spite of the opposition of the parliament, the bishop,[2] and the university; and throughout the rest of France, only after the passage of the *edict of Soissons*, which subjected its members to numerous and vexatious restrictions. The extensive privileges conferred upon the Society by the Holy See roused popular prejudice against it, and in the then existing state of public opinion did it no little harm. The professors of the university viewed with extreme jealousy the establishment by the side of them of a society of educators, whose lectures were given gratuitously, and listened to with enthusiasm. The Hugenots were fairly astonished that men should be so bold as to found a Society for the avowed purpose of entering into conflict with them, and on every available occasion exhibited toward its members their characteristic spirit of hatred and persecution. Finally, the *Jansenists*, conscious that the Jesuits were their most formidable antagonists on the doctrine *of grace*, combined their hostile efforts with those of the most relentless enemies of the Society. Then it was that *Arnauld*, the father of the great Jansenist, and advocate of the Parliament of Paris, rose in his place and delivered a most intemperate speech against them, in which he charged them with being the enemies of the king and the partisans of Spain. The opposition to them grew still more

[1] *The Month*, September, 1877, art. "Pombal and the Society of Jesus." (TR.) Cfr. *von Olfers*, On the Attempt to Murder the King of Portugal on September 3, 1758, being an Historical Inquiry, Berlin, 1839. Moreover, *Aquaviva*, the celebrated General of the Jesuits, by a decree of the year 1610, had emphatically condemned tyrannicide, and forbidden all Jesuits to even touch upon the subject in their lectures or writings.

[2] Not archbishop, for the See of Paris was raised to metropolitan rank only in 1622. See *Gams*, Series Eppor., p. 597. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

bitter and violent when *Henry IV.* selected one of them for his confessor, notwithstanding that they had been at no pains to deserve this token of royal confidence.

When, in 1594, *John Châtel* made an attempt upon the life of the king, the guilt of the deed was imputed to the Jesuits, on the ground that Châtel, who had been one of their students, had declared he had heard Father *Guéret* teach that tyrannicide was permissible—a proposition condemned in the most precise and emphatic terms by both the Society and the Holy See. Still, notwithstanding the frequent protestations of John Châtel, exonerating the Jesuits from any knowledge of his deed, the *whole* Society was expelled from France by a decree of parliament, dated December 29, 1594. The parliaments of Bordeaux and Toulouse took the Jesuits under their protection, and at their request they were again recalled by Henry IV.

Henry IV. was murdered by *Ravaillac*, and again every effort was made, but in vain, to fasten the guilt of the miscreant deed upon the Society. Its enemies were again baffled, but they did not despair of still accomplishing their purpose. Once more they cast about for a pretext, and it is a lamentable fact that this was furnished by the writings of some indiscreet members of the Society. The errors contained in the works of *Harduin*, *Berruyer*, *Pichon*, *Escobar*, *Tamburini*, and others, though condemned by the Holy See, were laid hold on by *Pascal*, a zealous Jansenist, and one eminently qualified, by his splendid and versatile talents, to turn his advantage to the best account. In his memorable *Lettres provinciales*,[1] in which the extraordinary brilliancy of the style is equaled only by the audacious dishonesty of the writer, he quoted erroneous opinions, scandalous passages, and garbled extracts from the writings of several theologians and casuists of the Society, and, after mutilating their sense, distorting their meaning, and wrenching them from their context, held them up to the

[1] *Nicole* translated these letters into Latin. They were soon translated into every living language. 10th ed., Cologne, 1684. A public commission, composed of thirteen French bishops and doctors, pronounced them libelous, whereupon they were prohibited. Cf. *de Maistre*, De l'Église Gallicane, ch. 9. Nay, even *Voltaire*, Siècle de Louis XIV., T. III., ct. 37, declared "that the whole work was built upon such a foundation."

Hosted by Google

world as fair specimens of the *moral teaching of the Jesuits as a body*. Thus, on the strength of only a few untenable and scandalous propositions, selected from the writings of a host of authors, and placed beside the maxim cruelly and falsely imputed to the Society, *that the end justifies the means*, were the Jesuits held up to the world as teaching a code of morals which they detest; while no reference was made to their numerous ascetical works, which are models of their kind, and would have supplied the very best means of forming a correct judgment of their moral teaching. To their other enemies were soon added *Madame de Pompadour*, the mistress of *Louis XV.*, to whom they had refused to furnish a confessor, unless she would break off her relations with the king and her friend, the *Duke de Choiseul*, the patron of the Encyclopaedists. These latter, led by *Voltaire* and *d'Alembert*, were specially interested in the overthrow of the Jesuits, who, on account of the ardent zeal they displayed in the cause of religion, the influence which in virtue of their office as teachers they exercised over the minds of youth, the consideration in which they were held by princes and sovereigns, and the loyal attachment they had always shown to the Holy See, were very naturally regarded as the most formidable and dangerous enemies to the revolutionary designs of this sect of philosophers. Hence Voltaire flung himself into the struggle against them with terrific earnestness, gathering up for this supreme effort all the energies of his soul, all the faculties of his mind, and all his power of derisive ridicule and scathing sarcasm. "Once we have destroyed the Jesuits," said he, writing to Helvetius in 1761, in a tone of exultant anticipation, "and that *infamous thing* (the Christian religion) will be only child's play for us." By his advice, and with the encouragement of the Marquis de Pombal, Madame de Pompadour, and the Duke de Choiseul, d'Alembert published his notorious work, *On the Destruction of the Jesuits*, the appearance of which was a sort of signal for a general attack. To accomplish his purposes against the Jesuits, Pombal had for a long time been making a liberal use of money, and had even approached the Court of Rome with a venal proposition for the same object. Choiseul had followed his example, and an

Hosted by Google

association of Jansenists collected a very considerable sum, called *the fund of safety*, which they used to hire unprincipled pamphleteers to calumniate the Society. When preparations so extensive and thorough had been made, only a pretext, no matter how trivial, was wanted to begin the work of destroying the Jesuits. This was soon furnished. Father *La Valette*, the Procurator General of the Society in the island of Martinique, for the prosperity of which his commercial ability had done so much, had consigned to a house in Marseilles two valuable cargoes, worth several millions of francs, which were seized by English cruisers, and he was in consequence unable to meet his bills. An attempt was made to hold the Society responsible for the loss, but it was answered that not only had La Valette engaged in commercial enterprises without the authorization, but against the positive prohibition of his superiors, who had on a previous occasion made good a loss of the same kind. A universal cry was at once raised against them. The printing-presses were kept busy in running off pamphlets, in which the faults and the mistakes of individual members were colored to suit the popular taste and published to the world. The subject was brought before the Parliament of Paris, where were many of the ancient and vigilant enemies of the Jesuits, who, at first feeling their way, cautiously abolished the privileges of the Society, and ordered certain works by its members, which had been long forgotten, to be burnt. But sadder still was the part taken by some of the members of the learned and respectable Benedictine Order of St. Maur, who seemed to have inherited a Jansenistic hatred of the Jesuits, in this memorable affair. They came to the aid of the parliament by publishing what they called *An Abstract of the Pernicious Assertions of the Jesuits*,[1] whilst the works written in defense of the Society were consigned to the flames.

[1] Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses, que les Jésuites ont enseignées avec l'approbation des Supérieurs, vérifiés par les commissaires du Parlement, Par. 1762; compiled by Roussel de la Tour, Member of Parliament, Abbé *Gouzet*, Minard, and other Benedictines of St. Maur, especially *Clemencet*. Even *Grimm*, though a Protestant, and one of the suffragators of the Encyclopaedists, refused to take upon him the responsibility of approving the work of the compilers against the Jesuits. Réponse au livre intitulé "Extraits des assertions

Hosted by Google

A strong effort was made by nearly all the bishops to save the Jesuits. They came together, and by an almost unanimous vote declared in favor of the Society, and bore honorable witness to the character and conduct of its individual members, but all to no purpose. By a decree of parliament, dated August 16, 1762, the Society was suppressed in France, because, as was alleged, it was dangerous to the State.[1] A pension or some honorable employment was offered to such of the members as would consent to affirm under oath that the spirit of the Institute was impious; but as very few were base enough to make so false a statement, nearly all were banished the country.

Two years later, Louis XV. confirmed by royal edict the decree of parliament, permitting, however, the members of the Society to live in the country as private individuals, subject to the authority of the bishops. The bull *Apostolicum* of Clement XIII. (1765), confirming anew the Society, had no effect other than to intensify the hatred against it.

In *Spain* a still more cruel fate awaited them. On the night of the 2d and 3d of April, 1767, all the Jesuits in the kingdom were placed under arrest, and conducted under guard to the sea-shore, where they were embarked on board of vessels bound for the Papal States. The edict of suppression of *Charles III.* was not made public until after this act of violence had taken place, and when at last it did appear it did not state that any preliminary investigation had been made, but simply said that the Society had been suppressed for

dangereuses, etc.;" the place where the book was printed not given, 1763–1765, 3 T., 4to. Cf. *Riffel*, l. c., p. 155 sq. *Patiss*, Complaints against the Society of Jesus, Vienna, 1866. Dr. *Henn*, The Black Book, Paderborn, 1865 (against the frivolous accusations of *Tholuck!*). *Roh*, S. J., The Old Cry: "The End Justifies the Means," Freiburg, 1869. *Jocham*, Jesuit Morals, and the Moral Infection of the People, Mentz, 1869.

[1] *Henry Heine*, the determined enemy of the Jesuits, had the manliness to brand such excuses with the severity they deserve. "Poor Jesuits," said he, "you are the bugbear and the scapegoats of the liberal party. For myself, I could never consent to join the outcry of my associates, who, at the mere mention of the name of Loyola, become as furious as bulls before whose eyes a red rag is held." *Goethe's* saying is also àpropos: "One who is universally hated must have something good in him."

Hosted by Google

grave causes. In the kingdom of *Naples* the Society was also suppressed November 20, 1767, by royal edict of *Ferdinand V.*, the son of *Charles III.*, who, however, was completely under the influence of his minister, *Tanucci.* The Society experienced the same cruel treatment from the brother of Charles III., *Ferdinand, Duke of Parma and Piacenza.*

Finally, the Court of Lisbon, together with all the Courts of the House of Bourbon, petitioned the Holy See to suppress the Society of Jesus. *Clement XIV.*, when making unusually large concessions to these Courts (*vide* p. 493), had requested time to examine into the charges against the Jesuits, but there was too much justice in such a request to be heard with favor by the princes of the House of Bourbon, who made the suppression of the Society a condition to the re-establishment by them of friendly relations with the Holy See. Yielding to their pressing demands, Clement XIV., by the *brief Dominus ac Redemptor Noster*, dated July 21, 1773,[1] in virtue of the fullness of his apostolic authority, suppressed the Society, because, as he said, in spite of many warnings, its members no longer kept in view the end, rendered the services, or procured the advantages which its founders contemplated in establishing it. The Society, he went on to say, has, from the very date of its foundation, given occasion of serious complaint by interference in matters that did not concern it, by exciting jealousy and promoting discord, and by teaching novel and dangerous doctrines. He closed by saying that the measure was necessary as a means of restoring amicable relations between the Holy See and the Courts of the Bourbon princes, who had already suppressed the Society and banished its members from their dominions, that Christians living in the bosom of the Church might be kept from flying at each other's throats (nros. 22, 25). On a former occasion, this Pope had said: "If you do not wish to see the Court of Rome fall from its present high estate, we must become reconciled with princes; for their arms reach beyond the boundaries of their own States, and the Alps and the Pyrenees are

[1] *Reumont*, Ganganelli, etc., p. 53–74; Germ. transl. of the Brief, p. 380–403; and in *Theiner*, Hist. of the Pontificate of Clement XIV., Vol. II., p. 356–376. It should be borne in mind that Theiner is a bitter enemy of the Jesuits. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

no barriers to their power." Clement XIV. would have shown himself at once more prudent and more just had he said to the Jesuits what Pius IX. did on a similar occasion in 1848. "In many countries," said he, "they are not willing to tolerate you or have you remain. Very good, then; withdraw from persecution for the present, and wait the return of better days." Had he done this, he would not have given a quasi-indorsement to charges that were *never proved.*

Thus was the Society of Jesus sacrificed to the intrigues of its enemies. No attempt was made to establish the charges brought against it; no defense of it by its friends was listened to! And, stranger still! no one thought of impeaching before a regularly constituted tribunal a Society whose members were accused of crimes the most odious, and such as had never before been laid to the charge of civilized men. It is evident, therefore, that force, and not justice, accomplished the suppression of the Society of Jesus. And, notwithstanding the wild outcry against the moral teaching of the Society as a body, the individual members convicted of personal immorality were so extremely *few* as to prove that in practice at least their morals were very nearly perfect. Even *Voltaire*, their inveterate enemy, bore this testimony to them in a letter to d'Alembert. "While doing my very best," said he, "to realize the motto *Écrasez l'infame*, I will not stoop to the meanness of defaming the Society of Jesus. The best years of my life have been spent in the schools of the Jesuits, and while there I have never listened to any teaching but what was good, or seen any conduct but what was exemplary."

It is possible this great Society might never have been illegally and violently suppressed, if its superiors had consented at the right moment to make certain modifications in its organization; but *Ricci*, the aged General, believing in the indestructibility of the Society, replied, *so it is said*, when approached upon the subject by his patron, Clement XIII., "*Let them be as they are, or let them cease to be*" (*Jesuitae aut sint ut sunt aut plane non sint*).[1]

[1] The Founder of the Society, St. Ignatius, on the contrary, said: "The Society shall adapt itself to the times, and not the times to the Society." See *Genelli*, l. c., p. 328.

Hosted by Google

As soon as the bull of suppression had been promulgated, a sufficient military force to insure its execution was stationed in Rome, and *Lorenzo Ricci*, with some of his assistants, was kept in confinement in the castle of Sant' Angelo (1775). But to the last hour of his life, the old man, knowing well whereof he spoke, continued to bear witness to the injustice done the Society, declaring that there was no adequate motive either for its suppression or for his own confinement. Nearly all the members of the Society bore up under their hard lot with noble and dignified resignation.[1]

In those countries in which the Jesuits still lived in peace and wielded a powerful influence, which had been lately increased by the words of Clement XIII. in commendation of the Society, the bull of suppression produced a profound sensation.

Frederic II., King *of Prussia*, believing with Lord *Bacon*[2] and *Leibnitz* that "if he would have really good schools, he must have those of the Jesuits," said he would not permit the good Fathers of the Society to close their schools in Silesia; for, since they came into that province, he had heard only words of unqualified praise of both their services and their conduct.[3] Out of regard, however, to the wishes of the Catholic authorities at Breslau, and of the Jesuits themselves, *who were unwilling to hold out against the papal bull*, Frederic *graciously consented* that their existence as a corporate body should cease, and that they should lay aside whatever was specifically characteristic of the Society, but insisted that

[1] Cf. *Riffel*, l. c., pp. 193 sq. *Theiner* mentions a few whose patience was not proof against what they regarded as an injustice. Clement XIV., Vol. II., p. 491.

[2] Ad paedagogiam quod attinet, brevissimum foret dictu: consule scholas Jesuitarum! nihil enim, quod in usum venit, his melius. Quae nobilissima pars pristinae disciplinae revocata est aliquatenus quasi postliminio in Jesuitarum collegiis, quorum quum intueor industriam sollertiamque tam in doctrina excolenda, quam in moribus informandis, illud occurrit Agesilai de Pharnabazo: *talis quum sis, utinam noster esses.* (De augment. scientiar.) *Hugo Grotius* thinks the same: Magna est Jesuitarum in vulgus auctoritas propter vitae sanctimoniam et quia non sumpta mercede juventus litteris scientiaeque praeceptis imbuitur. (Ann. de reb. Belg.) Cf., above, p. 304, note 1.

[3] *A. Menzel*, New History of the Germans, Vol. XII., p. 58 sq., 2d ed., Vol. VI.

Hosted by Google

they should continue to direct the schools as secular priests. *Catharine II.* of Russia, who in the partition of Poland had obtained the northern portion of Lithuania, or *White Russia*, in which there were two colleges conducted by the Fathers of the Society, the one at *Mohilev*, and the other at *Polotzk*, positively refused, in spite of the remonstrances of the Papal Legates, to allow the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* to be published in her dominions.[1] The Jesuits, after having obtained the permission of Pius VI., in 1778, were allowed by Catharine to establish a novitiate for the Society. She also gave them the direction of the schools in the cities named, and ordered them to convoke a General Congregation at Polotzk for the purpose of electing a Vicar General for the Russian Empire (1782). Accordingly, *Stanislaus Czernievicz*, then acting vice-provincial, was chosen the head of the Society, and ample powers were granted him to conduct its government, but on condition that a General should not be chosen in Rome. He was succeeded September 27, 1785, by Father *Lenkievicz*, whose powers were similarly restricted. The Emperor *Paul* having also manifested friendly feelings toward them, permitting them to open a church, which he gave them, in St. Petersburg, Pius VII. so far modified the bull of Clement XIV. as to permit them to establish themselves in Russia as a congregation, over which he appointed *Francis Kareu* superior. It is difficult to understand how a Society thus protected should have been expelled the Empire shortly after its re-establishment in other countries by the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* of Pius VII., dated August 7, 1814.

§ 373*b*. *Worship and Discipline from the Sixteenth Century.*

Sacror. rituum congregationis decreta authentica, quae ab an. 1558–1848 prodierunt, alphabetico ordine collecta. Leod., Brux. 1850. Manuale decretorum authenticorum sacrae congregat. rit., etc., ed. *Eberle*, Ratisb. 1851. The best edition of the *Decreta Authentica Congregationis sacrorum rituum* is the third Roman edition of 1856–1858, in 4 vols., 4to, by *Aloysius Gardellini*. (Tr.)

The Council of Trent published many decrees on *worship*,

[1] The documents on the subject may be had in the *Würzburg Friend of Religion*, April, 1847, and in *Buss*, The Society of Jesus, pp. 1321 sq.

Hosted by Google

calling the serious attention of bishops and parish-priests to whatever was in any way connected with the divine offices. The Roman Catechism, published by the same authority, drew attention to the same subject, adding some instructive remarks and explanations. The Roman Missal, Breviary, and Ritual were to serve as a rule of worship in the various dioceses. At the request of the Emperor *Ferdinand I.* and *Albert*, Duke of Bavaria, Pius IV. granted, by way of trial, permission to some bishops to distribute Communion under *both* kinds (see p. 351), but the practice, though favorably received at first, proved to have so many inconveniences that the bishops relinquished it of their own accord, and the Pope withdrew it. Many princes, and even bishops, unconsciously influenced by the practices of Protestants, petitioned the Holy See to simplify divine worship, to prohibit the too frequent exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, to restrict processions and pilgrimages, and to forbid blessings to be given, except in cases where there was a prescribed form either in the Roman Ritual or other approved work, representing that these precautions would remove many abuses. Pope *Clement VIII.* condemned the use of *unauthorized litanies in public worship*, declaring in his constitution *Sanctissimus* of the year 1601, "that as many persons, and even private individuals, under pretext of devotion, publish innumerable litanies, containing expressions either improper or scandalous, the Holy See, as in duty bound, prescribes that no forms are allowable other than those contained in the Roman Missals, Pontificals, Rituals, and Breviaries, and that of the Blessed Virgin, chanted in the chapel of Our Lady of Loreto; and that any one wishing to publish or use any others in the public offices of the Church shall, under severe penalties, to be inflicted by their respective bishops and ordinaries, first submit them to the Congregation of Rites." By the same constitution, the following litanies were approved: 1. The litany of All Saints: 2. That of Loreto.[1]

[1] As to the litany of the *Holy Name of Jesus*, the following statement is found in *Gardellini's* collection, n. 1553: Principes et Episcopi (Germaniae) supplicarunt SS., ut *has litanias de nomine Iesu* auctoritate Apostolica non solum confirmare, sed per publicum edictum toti Christianitati hoc calamito-

Hosted by Google

Notwithstanding the regulations of the Council of Trent, and the clear, formal, and explicit instructions contained in the Constitution of Pius V., dated July 7, 1568, the French bishops, during the eighteenth century, still tainted with the poison of Jansenism, took upon them to authorize the publication of new missals, offices, and breviaries for the use of the clergy of their dioceses, thus contributing to destroy in the country of the Most Christian King the simple and majestic unity of Catholic prayer and worship. The first to mar the beauty and unity of Catholic liturgy in France were *Nicholas Letourneaux* and the Jansenist, *Claude de Vert*, a Benedictine, who were the joint authors of the Clugny Breviary, in which devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the authority of the Holy See are equally depreciated. The next to make innovations in the liturgy was *Foinard*, a Jansenist, the author of the well-known work, "A Plan for a *New* Breviary, in which the Divine Office is to consist chiefly of Extracts from Holy Writ." His idea was to take texts from their connection; to isolate them or combine them with others, as best suited his purpose, in such way as to destroy their true meaning, and make them fit in with and support his own erroneous views. This idea was carried out in the *Paris Breviary*, composed by *Duguet*, a Jansenist, and published by authority of Cardinal de Noailles. The bishops of Orleans, Nevers, Metz, Auxerre, Troyes, Montpellier, Lyons, and Toulouse, together with several religious Orders, also published breviaries on the model of that of Paris, *the city they now professed to regard as the center of Gallican unity*, hardly ever mentioning the name of Rome, which was, they said, *only the center of Catholic unity*. Thus were the foundations of the Church in France so loosened, and the whole fabric so unsteady, that it barely escaped falling from the center of Catholic unity and becoming schismatical.[1]

Many new *feasts* were introduced from the sixteenth century onward, some in honor of the *Blessed Virgin*,[2] one of the *Rosary*, one of the *Holy Name of Jesus*, and one of the *Five Wounds of Christ*, commemorative of the *love* and *sufferings* of Our Dear Lord. About the middle of the eighteenth century the *Way of the Cross*, that admirable invention of Chris-

sissimo tempore singulariter commendare dignaretur. Emi PP. S. R. Congr. praepositi, re mature considerata, censuerunt: "Litanias praedictas esse approbandas, si SS. placuerit." Die 14. Aprilis, 1646. No final action on the part of His Holiness is recorded. Moreover, as often as the statutes of newly-founded religious institutes were laid before the various S. Congregations of the Holy See, they uniformly declared that none other than the litany of the Saints and that of Loreto were approved for the *whole* Church. (Tr.)

[1] See *Darras*, Gen. Hist. of the Church, Vol. IV., pp. 453–456. (Tr.)

[2] Festum nominis B. M. V.; festum septem dolorum B. M. V.; desponsatio B. M. V.; festum B. M. V. de monte Carmelo; festum dedicationis St. Mar. ad Nives; festum nominis Mariae de Victoria; festum B. M. V. de Mercede (Our Lady of Mercy, for the deliverance of captive Christians); festum Patrocinii B. M. V.

Hosted by Google

tian love, and the *Devotion of the Stations*, were introduced to take the place of pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and were intended to bring vividly before the imagination the places consecrated by the sufferings of Christ.

On the other hand, however, Benedict XIV., Clement XIV., and Pius VI., yielding to the representations of several princes, diminished the number of *public* holidays; at first enjoining but the hearing of Holy Mass, whilst allowing servile work; then suppressing some of the Blessed Virgin, those of the apostles, and others, and transferring their celebration to the Sundays following the days originally set apart for the feasts. The new feasts already mentioned were also either celebrated *in choir* or similarly transferred.

With a view to revive the primitive spirit, and in some measure to restore the primitive practices of *ecclesiastical discipline*, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV., *De Reformatione*, c. 8), had enacted that public penances should be done for *public* crimes; but so violent was the opposition to the decree that, in spite of the efforts of Benedict XIII. to have it enforced, it remained a dead letter. To compensate in some sort for this failure, the Council (Sess. XXV., *De Indulgentiis*) enacted that *indulgences* "useful and very salutary for Christians" should be sparingly granted; that every kind of traffic in dispensing them must be utterly abolished; and that the very name and office of alms-gatherers be done away with. (Sess. XXI., *De Reform.*, c. 9.)

From this time forth indulgences were principally attached only to *jubilees*, which, by decree of Paul II. (1470), were to be renewed every twenty-five years; then to certain *forms of prayer;* to particular *devotions;* and to other extraordinary events or unusual acts of worship. The *Inquisition*, consisting of six cardinals, was revived by *Paul III.* (1549) for the purpose of counteracting the influence and combating the errors of Protestantism at Rome and elsewhere. It survived longest in the smaller States of Italy. It was abolished in *Lombardy* in 1775, by Maria Teresa; in *Sicily* in 1782, by King Ferdinand; in *Tuscany* in the same year, by Grand Duke Leopold; and finally in *Venice* in 1797. In the last named place it was wholly a *political* institution. It was likewise

Hosted by Google

abolished in *Spain* in 1820, and in *Portugal* in 1826, under John VI. At the present day it exists only in Rome, as *modified* by *Pius V.* and *Sixtus V.*, and is known under the name of the *Sacrum Officium*, *Congregatio inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis*, and consists of twelve cardinals, with whom are associated as assistants a number of *consultors* and *qualifiers*. It is presided over by the Pope, and its office is to examine and pass judgment upon all words, writings, and deeds contrary to religion.[1]

§ 374. *Spread of Christianity.* (Cfr. § 349.)

See general sources of information; Lettres édifiantes, and † *Wittmann*, The Beauty of the Church Manifested in her Missions, p. 840. *Henrion*, General History of the Missions, Vol. IV. *Hahn*, Hist. of the Missions, Vol. IV. *Marshall*, The Christian Missions, their Messengers, etc. *Grundemann*, Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867.

The Catholic Church in *China* was mainly sustained and consolidated by the exertions of the Seminary for Foreign Missions, founded in Paris in 1663. Unfortunately, the heated discussions that broke out among the missionaries regarding *Chinese customs*[2] did much to retard the progress of religion. The first dispute arose concerning an ancient custom the Chinese have of paying religious honors to Confucius and their departed ancestors, which those newly converted to Christianity obstinately refused to give up. Not wishing to shock their sense of filial piety, the Jesuits permitted them to continue the custom, while the Dominicans peremptorily forbade them to do so. Again, for want of a sign in the Chinese language adequately expressing the idea of *God*, the Jesuits had used indifferently the words *Tin-tshu* or Lord of Heaven, and *Tien* and *Shangti* or Supreme Emperor, and had allowed them to be employed by others, taking care, however, to prevent any false or idolatrous ideas or associations being connected with them in their Christian sense. *Father Ricci*, the founder of the Chinese missions, using the same

[1] *Bangen*, The Roman Court and its Actual Organization, Münster, 1854, pp. 92–124.

[2] See p. 407.

Hosted by Google

precautions, permitted both forms of expression. In the preceding epoch both orders had pleaded their cases in Rome, and obtained conflicting decisions from Popes *Innocent X.* and *Alexander VII.*

On the revival of the controversy, *Clement XI.* sent *Tournon* as his Legate to examine the questions involved on the spot amid their surroundings. His judgment was in accord with the decisions of the *Congregation* held *in Rome* in 1704, and he moreover forbade, in a document issued at Nanking in 1707, the further use of the words *Tien* and *Shangti*, hitherto used to designate God. He was in consequence arrested by the enraged Emperor, and cast into prison at Macao, where he languished until 1710, when he died. By the bull *Ex illa die* of 1715, Clement XI. forbade, in still more precise and emphatic terms, the mingling of heathen customs with Christian rites, and the prohibition was renewed under still severer penalties by Benedict XIV. in his bull *Ex quo singulari* of 1742. The result of these measures was a general persecution, from which, however, a large number of Christians managed to escape.

The prosperity of the Christian communities in China received a severe shock in the suppression of the Society of Jesus and the destruction of the Seminary for Foreign Missions at Paris by the French Revolutionists.[1]

It was apparently impossible for Christianity to grow either in extent or influence in the *East Indies*, except by conforming in some measure at least to the national customs of the people. The occasion of the breaking out of the first persecution against the Christians at *Pondichery* was the production, in 1701, of one of those sacred dramas, so familiar to the Jesuits, in which St. George was represented as slaying the gods of India. Their condition became still more critical when

[1] Cfr. *Platel* (Norbert), Mémoires sur les affaires des Jésuites, etc., Lisb. 1766, 2 T., 4to. *Leibnitz*, too, defended the Jesuits in Novissima Sinica, 1697. For the controversial literature, see *Mamachi*, Orig. et antiq. chr., T. II., p. 407. *Pray*, Hist. of the Disputes on the Chinese Customs, Augsburg, 1791, 3 vols. Conf., likewise, the Periodical, *Voices* (Stimmen) *from Maria Laach*, year 1872, p. 278–287.

Hosted by Google

Tournon, on his way to China, landed at Pondichery, and inhibited to the new converts what are known as the *ancient Malabar customs*, and when *Benedict XIV.* later on sustained his action. From that time forth it seemed that all hope of spreading the Gospel in India must be given up. To add to existing difficulties and complete the threatened disaster, the English and Dutch, whose power was constantly growing in these countries, refused to tolerate the presence of even Protestant missionaries.

In *Farther India*, comprising the former kingdom of *Assam*, the empire of *Burmah*, the kingdom of *Siam*, *Malay Peninsula*, and the empire of *Anam*, the last of which includes the provinces of *Tonquin*, *Cochin-China*, *Tsiampa*, *Camboja*, *Laos*, and *Laitho*, the Gospel was (after St. Xavier) first preached by the three Jesuit Fathers *Blandinotti*, *Alexander de Rhodez* (1627), and *Anthony Marquez*. They were fortunate enough to convert three bonzes, who in turn became zealous missionaries. As time went on, a degree of ecclesiastical organization was introduced, and in 1670 a synod was held at *Diughieu*. But here, too, the Church had to pass through the ordeal of persecution, which, breaking out in 1694, occasioned the demolition of Christian temples[1] and the exile or death of Christian pastors. In the years 1721 and 1734 many Jesuits were put to the sword for refusing to tramp under foot the Sign of man's redemption. Toward the close of the present epoch the condition of the Christians was somewhat improved, and many of the natives, in dedicating themselves to the service of the altar, contributed to promote the spread of the Gospel.

After the revocation of the edict of persecution by the last Emperor, Dsha-Loang, the Christians again enjoyed freedom of worship, and the condition of the Church was steadily improved. The Jesuits were also the first to preach the Gospel

[1] Hist. de l'établissement du Christianisme dans les Indes orientales, Par. 1803, 2 T. Cf. The New Messenger of the World, by *J. Stoecklein*, Augsburg, 1726, Pt. XIX., preface. *Urb. Cerri*, État présent de l'Église romaine dans toutes les parties du monde, Amst. 1716. *Rhodez, S. J.*, Missionary Travels in China, Tonquin, and Cochin-China, Freiburg, 1858.

Hosted by Google

in *Cochin-China*,[1] where they were to be found as early as the year 1618, Father *Borri* being the best known of them. The fortunes of the Christians of Tonquin have been very varied, and even in our own time persecution has hardly ceased in that country.

The first efforts of the Jesuits to preach the Gospel in *Tibet*[2] were seemingly unsuccessful. The *Capuchins* (from 1707), under their superior, Father *Horace della Penna*, were more fortunate, as many of the natives, convinced by their preaching, renounced Buddhism and embraced Christianity. Their success was somewhat facilitated by the fact that the hierarchy of Tibet, in its external aspects, presented a striking similarity to that of the Catholic Church.[3] The *Dalai Lāma* (i. e. principal or ocean) gave them leave to found a hospice at *Lassa*. The persecutions of 1737 and 1742, while they retarded the progress of the mission, did not cause the destruction of the houses of the missionaries.

In *South America* the Gospel was preached both by Franciscans and Jesuits, the missions of that country being among the most splendid triumphs of the latter. The Jesuits, Father *Sandoval* and Blessed *Peter Claver*, both labored zealously and successfully in this mission. The latter, a native of Catalonia, from the moment of his arrival at Cartagena, in 1615, till his death, in 1654, performed marvels of Christian charity, converting multitudes of negroes, and literally carrying out in his daily life the promise he had made when taking his solemn vows, "to be the slave of the negro slaves." The labors of *St. Louis Bertrand*, of the Order of Friars Preachers in *New Granada*, were also attended with a large measure of success (1562–1569). On the western coast of South America the Jesuits established the *Llanos Missions*, chiefly under the direction of German Fathers, and the *Maynas Missions* along the banks of the Upper Amazon (since 1640). *Brazil* was first evangelized by Fathers *Anchieta* and *Nobreya*,

[1] *J. Koffler*, Historica Cochinchinae descriptio, in epitomen redacta ab Anselm. Eckard, ed. *Chr. Murr*, Norimb. 1703.

[2] Relazione del principio e stato presente della missione del Tibet, Roma, 1722. *P. Giorgi*, Alphabetum Tibetan., Romae, 1762.

[3] See Vol. I., pp. 78 et sq.

Hosted by Google

also Jesuits, who were succeeded about the year 1655 by the celebrated preacher *Anthony Vieira.*[1]

This distinguished Jesuit, who was styled the Cicero of Portugal, and who was in matter of fact the Las Casas of Brazil, introduced into that country, together with the teachings of the Gospel, a knowledge of the arts and sciences, of industry and commerce, and an ardent love of freedom. Torn from his spiritual children, whom he so dearly loved, by the perfidy of his countrymen, and carried away by force to Lisbon, he again obtained leave to return in his old age, and pass the declining days of his life amid the scenes of the apostolic labors of his youth. He died at Bahia in 1697, then holding the office of *Superior General* of the Missions of Maranham.

There is probably no country in the world whose missionary history is more worthy of study than the United States, and certainly none where the missionaries were more devoted or gave their lives more freely for the spiritual well-being of the natives. The faith came to the Indian simultaneously with the discovery of the land in which he dwelt, for in those days priests were the inseparable companions of every voyage of discovery, whether from the ports of the Old World or the stations established in the New. In a work like this, it is not possible to do more than give the names of the heroes whose deeds it would be a pleasure to record, and the dates of events over which the Catholic writer loves to linger. The *first* missionaries to set foot on the territory now included within the limits of the United States were the Right Rev. *John Juarez, Bishop of Florida,* and his companions. They touched the shores of Florida in April, 1528. It is supposed the bishop and a companion perished either of hunger or from the hostility of the Indians in the same year. Father *Louis Cancer,* the heroic leader of a small band of Dominicans, who came to Florida in 1549, had barely touched land when he was struck dead with a club in the hands of an Indian. The Dominicans renewed their efforts in 1553 and 1559. St. Augustine, the oldest town, and containing the oldest church in the United States, was laid out by *Melandez,* a Spanish admiral, in 1565. But the missions of Florida were destroyed; the Indians dispersed; and the Franciscan monastery of St. Helena, in the town of St. Augustine, converted into a barrack after the cession of Florida to England by the treaty of Paris in 1763. So complete was the subversion of Christianity by the English in Florida that, on the breaking out of the War of Independence, not a single mission was to be found in the whole extent of that territory. *Mark of Nice,* a Franciscan missionary, penetrated to New Mexico in 1540. Father *Padilla* and Brother *John of the Cross,* both Franciscans, who first attempted to preach the Gospel within the territory of the present diocese of *Santa Fé,* each received a mar-

[1] *Kraus,* Ch. Hist., Vol. III., p. 509. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

tyr's crown. Nearly forty years went by, and in 1581 three more heroes of the same Order met a like fate, and in the following year *Santa Fé*, the second oldest city in the United States, was founded. But about twenty years later the missions under Father *Escobar* were very successful, whole tribes coming into the Church together, and Mr. *Shea* relates that "the Indians on the Rio Grande could read and write before the Puritans were established on the shores of New England." [1]

Texas was visited in 1544 by Father *Andrew de Olmos*, a Spanish Franciscan, but no permanent mission was established until 1688, when fourteen priests and seven lay brothers of the same Order began their labors, and continued them with profit for above one hundred years.

In *California* the first Mass was celebrated by a Franciscan in 1601, but the true Apostle of the State was the Italian, Father *Juniper Serra*, also a Franciscan, who, with three other priests of the same Order, accompanied the expedition of *Galvez* in 1769. Their first mission was established at San Diego, whence he went north, founding, June 27, 1776, the present city of San Francisco († 1784). The seeds of Christianity were first sown in *Old California* in 1697 by the Jesuits, *Salvatierra* and *Francis Kuehn*, the latter of whom had been a professor of mathematics at Ingolstadt. It required all their firmness and patient perseverance to root out the vice of polygamy, and here, as elsewhere, Christianity was the forerunner of civilization, the gracious influences of which followed close in its wake. On the suppression of the Jesuits, the Franciscans and Dominicans took up and carried forward the work they had here begun, thus permanently securing the blessings of religion to these benighted people.

In 1570 *Father Segura* and eight Jesuits perished in the present State of *Maryland* through the treachery of *Don Luis*, a young Indian, who had been taken to Spain by some of the early Spanish navigators, where he received a Christian education, but retained his savage and perfidious instincts. The State was formally occupied by the Catholic Pilgrim Fathers on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1634. Accompanying these pioneers of religious freedom in the United States were Fathers *White* and *Altham*, both Jesuits, and the *first* English-speaking priests who labored for the salvation of the Indian on this Continent. These good priests, assisted by others, who arrived from England and from the Seminary of Douai, extended the field of their labors, and so successful were they that within five years after the first settlement was made they had *five* permanent stations, and five years later had converted the tribe of Pascatoways, with the Chief Charles; had brought whole villages under the yoke of Christ; and induced many of the Protestant colonists to return to the faith of their fathers. Such was the flourishing mission destroyed by Clayborne and his band of Puritan fanatics, who expelled the Catholic governor and carried off or sold the priests into slavery.

In the year 1609, eleven years before the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock, a mission had been established in *Maine*, on Neutral Island, in Scoodic river, by the Jesuits, Fathers *Biard* and *Massé*, whence it was removed in 1612 to Mount Desert Island, at the mouth of the Penobscot, in the present

[1] History of the Catholic Missions.

Hosted by Google

diocese of Portland. While the buildings were still in course of erection, the English, under the command of *Argall*, a furious bigot, attacked the place, killed *Brother du Thet*, carried off priests and colonists, and left the mission a heap of ruins.

About 1611 the French Jesuits had established a mission in *Canada*, which was soon in a flourishing condition, and, with the co-operation of missionaries from other Religious Orders, shortly placed upon a permanent footing, notwithstanding the inconveniences of a rigorous climate and the hostility of some of the natives. From this place *Father Druillettes*, a Jesuit, went to convert the Abnaki of Maine, and established the second mission in that territory on the upper Kennebec in 1646. With the aid of the Franciscans and some secular priests, the Jesuits succeeded in converting the whole Abnaki tribe to Christianity. Again, the English from Massachusetts invaded these missions, dispersed the Indians, drove away or slew the priests, and destroyed the chapels. The noble Indians clung to their faith amid every sort of temptation and trial, and again rallied round the saintly *Sebastian Râle*, a Jesuit, when he came among them in 1695. This venerable priest and splendid Indian scholar, the greatest of the Abnaki missionaries, and one of the most illustrious Jesuits of North America, was most barbarously murdered by the English and Mohawks in 1724, who, having outraged and mangled his body in a manner that would disgrace a savage, proceeded to rifle the chapel and profane the Sacred Host. The English did fully as much as the Indian to prevent the spread of Christianity through the territory of North America.

Le Caron, a Franciscan missionary, had, in the words of Bancroft, "years before the Pilgrims anchored within Cape Cod, penetrated the lands of the *Mohawk*, had passed to the north into the hunting-grounds of the Wyandots, and on foot, or paddling his canoe, gone onward till he reached the shores of Lake Huron."

The first missionaries, however, in what is now the State of New York were Fathers *Jogues*[1] and *Lalande*, who were sent from Quebec in 1646 to found a mission among the Mohawks, by whom they were both murdered October 18th of the same year, at the village of Caughnawaga, near the site of which stands the present city of Schenectady. Father Jogues had been taken prisoner and cruelly tortured by the same tribe in 1642, but, by the aid of the Dutch, made good his escape, only finally, like the Jesuit, *René Goupil*, who was tomahawked by them in the same year on the shores of Lake Champlain, to meet his death among them. The heroic and indefatigable *Brebeuf*, who so well appreciated the peculiar character of the Indian (*Huron*) mind, and had thoroughly mastered their language, was, together with his associate, *Lalemant*, captured by the *Iroquois*, and put to death with the most cruel torments (March 16, 1649).[2] Father Jogues was succeeded by Father *Le Moyne* in 1654, who, with Fathers *Chaumonot*, *Dablon*, and *Bressani*, all Jesuits, went among the Onondagas and Mohawks, and built St. Mary's Chapel on the site where now stands the city of Syracuse; and in this humble chapel was the Holy Mass offered up, November 14, 1655, for the first time in the State of New York. Their success ex-

[1] *Felix Martin*, Life of Jogues, S. J., Paris, 1873.

[2] Amer. Cyclopaed., art. "Brebeuf."

Hosted by Google

cited the jealousy of the medicine-men, and to escape being massacred were obliged to fly to Canada not quite three years later, March 20, 1658. Father *Le Moyne* again visited the Five Nations of the Empire State in 1661, and after baptizing two hundred children, returned to Canada, where he died in 1666. By the year 1668 the cross rose above every village from the shores of the Hudson to the waters of Lake Erie. The village of Caughnawaga, on the Mohawk, where the first martyrs had offered their lives, became the center of the missions of the Five Nations. To escape the evil influence and the persecution of their countrymen, the Indians of Caughnawaga, most of whom were Mohawks, removed to the St. Louis rapids, on the St. Lawrence, some miles above Montreal, where they founded a new village of the same name in 1676. The other missions of New York were, as usual, broken up by the English, after they came into possession of the territory by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713.

Jogues, whose name has been already mentioned, and *Raymbault*, were the first to preach Christianity in the Lake country in 1641. They did not remain, but were followed in 1660 by the venerable Father *Ménard*, also a Jesuit, who attempted to plant a mission three hundred miles west of Sault Ste. Marie. His fate is not known, but he is supposed to have perished either of hunger or by the tomahawk, and years after his cassock and breviary were found preserved as amulets among the Sioux. He was succeeded by Father *Allouez*, who in 1665 established the mission of *Lapointe*, on the western extremity of Lake Superior. Many other missions were established, one of the most important being that at Green Bay by Father *André*, all of which were closed on the suppression of the Society of Jesus. Father *Potier*, the last who labored in the country of the Great Lakes, died in 1781.

In the year 1673 the "Great River" was discovered by the celebrated Jesuit, Father *Marquette*, whose name will live both in the Lake Country and in the Valley of the Mississippi as long as this continent lasts. Starting at the Falls of St. Anthony, in the present State of Minnesota, he and other Jesuits explored the "Father of Waters" down as far as the mouth of the Arkansas, everywhere along their course announcing the glad tidings of the Gospel to the inhabitants; but to the humble Franciscan, Father *Hennepin*, is reserved the glory of having been the first person who explored the Mississippi from near its source to its mouth, and of having given the names of two of the greatest saints of his Order to the now celebrated *Falls of St. Anthony*, and to *Lake St. Clair*. Both *Marquette* and *Allouez* preached the Gospel to the Illinois, and Fathers *Poisson* and *Souel* suffered martyrdom at the hands of the tribe of the Natchez, in the Mississippi Valley.

Such are a few of the splendid triumphs of Catholic missionaries within the country now known as the United States, and such a few of the historical events of which every Catholic should be proud.

In the year 1675, through the influence of Louis XIV., a bishopric was established at *Quebec*, the most important place at that time in Canada, which, down to the year 1763, when the colony was ceded to England, continued to be filled by excellent bishops. This cession, however, did not interfere

Hosted by Google

with the labors of missionaries, by whom many converts were made among the tribes of the Iroquois, Hurons, and Illinois.

In *Africa* the Capuchins, though, as has been already said,[1] working in the face of the most formidable difficulties, did not relax their noble efforts to gain souls to Christ. One of their number, *Zuchelli Congo*, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, converted the King of *Segno*. Missions were established at Cacongo and Loango in 1766 by some French priests, which they were forced after a time to relinquish, being unable to bear up under the pestilential heats of the climate.

[1] See p. 411.

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM.

Gieseler's Church History, Vol. IV., published by *Redepenning*, Bonn, 1857 (from 1848–1814). *Hagenbach*, History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 2d ed., Lps. 1848 sq. (4th revised edit., Lps. 1871, 1872, or Vols. VI. and VII.; Engl. transl., by *Jno. F. Hurst*, D.D., New York. 1869.—Tr.) *Baur*, Ch. H. from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century, or Vol. IV., p. 572–679. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 519 sq.

§ 375. *On the Constitution of the Protestant Churches and their Relations to the State.*

Bibliography the same as at the head of § 336.

We have already seen (§§ 329 and 330) that the *episcopal* and *presbyterian* systems were alternately predominant in England until the accession of *William III. of Orange*, when the Episcopal was declared the Established Church for both England and Ireland. At the same time, freedom of worship was granted to all Dissenters, except *Socinians* and Catholics, who were not granted equal rights with other nonconformists until 1779. The Scotch expressed their determination to have the presbyterian form of church government in terms so decided and threatening that it was not thought safe to refuse it to them. The supreme ecclesiastical authority was vested in a General Assembly, which convened annually at Edinburgh, and was composed of representatives from the fifteen Provincial Synods.

In *Germany*, after the Peace of Westphalia, the efforts of the Protestants were directed toward securing the rights guaranteed them by that treaty. The duty of seeing to it that Protestants enjoyed these rights was vested in the deputies to the Permanent Diet of Ratisbon (*Corpus Evangelicorum*), (after 1663), which was a *political*, rather than a religious bond of union. As was quite natural, the Protestant Churches were but the subservient tools of the civil power, for in every State

Hosted by Google

in which the Reformation obtained a foothold the tiara was added to the crown and the ring and crosier to the scepter. In the national churches the spiritual was only a branch of the civil authority, and was exercised under its direction by consistories and ministers of public worship. At distant intervals the representatives of some provincial States convened in small synods, and while their suggestions might be condescendingly listened to, every demand in favor of the dignity or the freedom of the Church was repelled as an unwarrantable assumption of *clerical arrogance*. In the eyes of princes the Church was a respectable and, on the whole, not an inefficient police organization; and its estates and revenues were applied to objects wholly foreign to religion.

Should any one be bold enough to advocate religious freedom through the press, the representatives of that palladium of the rights of the people were at once given to understand that they must not invade those of princes. Even science contributed its part to the exaltation of the civil power over the Church. The theologians of Naumburg (see § 340, p. 376) declared that the transference of the spiritual to the civil authority was lawful, and sanctioned by Holy Writ; although it is but just to add that some of them objected, saying that Christ did not rescue His followers from the bondage of the Pope to have them become the lackeys of politicians.

In the early years of the Reformation the *episcopal* was the prevailing system of church government, but it gradually lost favor until the opening of the eighteenth century, when the *territorial system*, as scientifically set forth by *Puffendorf* in his *De habitu religionis Christianae ad vitam civilem*, published in 1687, and still further developed by *Thomasius* (fr. 1692) and *Boehmer* (fr. 1714), was substituted in its room.

Some time later a theological party sprung up, which, putting aside the special views of both Catholics and Protestants as to the origin of the Church, proved from the witness of monuments, reaching back more than ten centuries, that the Church had vested rights of her own. Starting with this proposition, *Pfaff*, Chancellor of Tübingen, drew out what he called the *Collegial System* (1719), according to which the Church is a corporate and independent body, possessing the

Hosted by Google

inherent right of self-government, which may be transferred to the civil power by treaty, but which, when the conditions are changed out of which the compact grew, *again lapses to the Church.*[1] But the defect of this theory is the circumstance, overlooked by its author, that the transference by treaty of the rights of the Church, of which he speaks, in matter of fact never took place, this link in the argument being *assumed* to account for the existing condition of things. However, the theory had never any practical consequences, the princes continuing to exercise the functions of bishops over the churches in their several States. As to a Head, the Lutheran Church never had any, and what was intended to serve as such was never recognized.

§ 376. *Dogma and Theologians.*

Planck, Hist. of Protestant Doctrine since the Drawing up of the Formula of Concord; *Walch*, Religious Disputes, Vol. I.; *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology: "*Rise of the Opposition to Antique Orthodoxy*," p. 595–669.

After the death of Melanchthon, the two parties of the Philippists and Lutherans, into which the Reformation had split during the lifetime of its founders, were for some years alternately victorious, until, finally, through the Form of Concord, and the energy of its framers and promoters, orthodox *Lutheranism* gained a complete triumph in Germany. The University of *Helmstaedt*, however, through the influence of its founder, Julius, Duke of Brunswick, had never accepted the conditions of the Form of Concord, and was therefore free to cultivate and encourage more liberal tendencies. But the teaching of *Daniel Hoffmann*, one of its members, who, following the pattern left him by Luther, traduced philosophy as at once immoral and atheistic, was regarded as so shocking and blasphemous that it was declared an outrage on reason

[1] His work, De originib. juris ecclesiastici veraque ejusdem indole, Tueb. 1719; new edit., 1720, with a treatise, De successione Episcopali. Cfr. *Nettelbladt*, De trib. systemat. doctr. de jure sacr. dirigendor. (Observatt. jur. eccl., Halae, 1783). *Stahl*, Constitution of the Church according to the Doctrine and Law of the Protestants, Erlangen, 1840. *Puchta*, Introduction to Canonical Law, Lps. 1840. Cfr., moreover, *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 596 sq.

Hosted by Google

and an insult to the philosophical faculty, and he was in consequence deprived of his professorship by the prince in 1601.

To this seat of learning belonged also *George Calixtus* († 1656), who, by adopting the historical method, sought to give to theology greater breadth and freedom of treatment. But his views on grace and good works, his method of disassociating ethics from dogmatic teaching, his assertion that the mystery of the Trinity was not plainly revealed in the Old Testament, and especially his attempts to explain away the subtleties of the Form of Concord, brought him under the suspicion of his co-religionists, who charged him with wishing to introduce a corrupt *syncretism* (see p. 323). They would have no authority, no rule of Faith but the Form of Concord, and accordingly the ablest of their theologians, among whom were *Calovius*, *Quenstedt*, *Koenig*, and *Baier*, set about refurbishing the weapons of Scholasticism to defend it. The Aristotelian philosophy was again restored, and the categories of *being* and *modality* again applied to the treatment of dogmatic theology. Considering the tenacity with which these theologians clung to what they supposed to be orthodox Lutheranism, it need not surprise us to find them given over to every sort of superstition, and, like Luther, possessed of a firm faith in witchcraft and sorcery, and believing with refreshing simplicity in the truth of his conflicts with the devil.

While *Frederic Spee* and other priests of the Catholic Church (see §§ 282, 353) were manfully and successfully opposing the absurd and barbarous practice of trying people for witchcraft, *Benedict Carpzov*, of Leipsig († 1666), who was styled the law-giver of Saxony, and whose opinion in matters of canon and criminal law was of great weight, maintained not only that sorcery itself should be severely punished, but also the denial of the reality of diabolical pacts;[1] and on this latter subject *John Henry Pott*, a celebrated professor at the University of Jena, published in 1689 a treatise entitled *De*

[1] On the Hist. of the Superstitious Practices of Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century (*Illgen's* Hist. and Theol. Review, 1841, p. 181); *Menzel*, Modern Hist. of Germany, Vol. VIII., p. 59 sq. *Freiburg Eccl.* Cyclopaed., Vol. V., p. 160; Fr. tr., Vol. 22 p. 301.

Hosted by Google

nefando lamiarum cum diabolo coitu. *Thomasius*[1] was the first to turn the tide of public opinion against these cruel and ridiculous trials. The last execution of witches took place in the Protestant cities of Quedlinburg in 1750 and Glarus in 1783.

Many orthodox Lutherans, adhering servilely to the letter of the law, regarded all personal effort *at sanctification* as useless and displeasing to God. One of the most remarkable men of this epoch, speaking of this blind and unreasonable faith, makes the following complaint: "In these latter days," he says, "there are four dumb idols set up for worship in the churches of the Christian world, viz., the baptistery, the pulpit, the confessional, and the altar; and people, conscious that they are baptized, that they hear the word of God, and go to confession and communion, content themselves with the external forms of Christianity, taking no thought of its inward power and virtue!"

As one extreme always produces its opposite, so this dreary and formal orthodoxy was opposed by the warm and more attractive Christianity of *Philip James Spener.*[2] Spener was born at Rappoldsweiler, in Upper Alsace, in the year 1635; was educated at Strasburg, where he first became pastor; thence he went to Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he was appointed dean of the clergy (1666), then superior preacher to the Court of Dresden (1688); and, finally, driven thence on account of his energetic remonstrances with the Elector on his personal vices, withdrew to Berlin, where he received the office of Provost of the Church of St. Nicholas (1691). To a highly cultivated intellect he united a sincere love of truth, and so nice an appreciation of true Christian feeling, that, in spite of the prejudices of youth and his attachment to the teachings and worship of his Church, he could not remain blind to the dangers that threatened the repulsive theological methods of the orthodox Lutherans, and their barren and

[1] *Luden*, Thomasius, His Life and His Writings, Berlin, 1803.

[2] *Hossbach*, Spener and His Age, Berlin, 1824 sq., 2 vols. *Knapp*, The Life and Character of Some Pious and Learned Men of the Last Century, Halle, 1829. *Franke*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, Vol. II., p. 130–189, and 213–240. For further statements of bibliography, see *Dorner*, l. c., p. 624–648.

Hosted by Google

dreary style of preaching. This conviction deepened when he began to study as his models the writings of the Dominican, *John Tauler*, whose heart was as warm as his intellect was brilliant, and to whom Spener was indebted for the devotional feeling and nervous energy which, in spite of their tedious prolixity, his sermons really possessed. Having in view a thorough reform of the existing ecclesiastical organization, he laid it down as a principle in nearly all his sermons *that religion is wholly an affair of the heart, and that a preacher, to properly exercise his ministry, must bring home to the minds and hearts of his hearers the convictions and feelings with which he himself is carried away.* Hence he held that no one can be a Christian theologian, in the true sense, who has not had personal experience of the influence wrought on the soul by the saving truths of religion. As if to give practical expression to his idea of a *model religious community*, Spener commenced, in the year 1670, to hold little reunions (*collegia pietatis*) at his house, in which he strengthened the faith and warmed the piety of those present by devotional explanations of passages of Scripture and by holy converse.

These efforts, which were at first an expression of a real want of the age, in their further development assumed a peculiar and grotesque form. The new school soon began to give signs of the presence of a *spirit of sectarian pride*, and to develop habits of *gloomy melancholy*, so antagonistic to the serious yet cheerful serenity that always accompanies true piety.[1] After the first sympathetic feelings, inspired by the earnestness of the *Pietists*, as they were now called, on account of their ostentatious displays of piety, had passed away, they began to lose favor, chiefly on account of the rigorous code of morals advocated, and, as far as possible, enforced by Spener. Enemies rose up against him on all sides. The hostility of the worldly and corrupt was to be expected; but, besides these, he counted among his adversaries many theologians of learning and ability, who reproached him, not in-

[1] *Pia desideria* (Pious Desires), or a Heartfelt desire after a Godly Improvement of the True Evangelical Church (First Preface to *Arndt's* Postilla evang., 1675), Frkft. 1678 sq.

Hosted by Google

deed with denying outright the Christian dogmas, but with depreciating their importance by teaching that they contributed little to the edification of souls.

Faithful to their traditions, they at once hastened to make civil princes the arbiters of their theological quarrels. The greatest excitement prevailed in Leipsig, where three professors, disciples of Spener's, one of whom was *Augustus Herman Franke*, opened in 1689 a course of devotional lectures on the Holy Scriptures, which were partially scientific in character, but mainly practical, being for the most part an illustration of how Scripture lessons should be applied to the duties of everyday life. They were largely attended by students and the better classes of citizens, and were productive of much good. Two of their colleagues, *Carpzov* and *Loescher*, accused the lecturers of bringing public worship into contempt, of degrading science, of casting souls into a state of despondent melancholy, and of fostering spiritual pride and exclusiveness. Forced to leave Leipsig (1690), the three professors, in concert with Thomasius, founded the *University of Halle* in 1694. The neighboring University of Wittenberg, taking alarm at this step, became from this time forth more intensely Lutheran than ever, and the two centers of learning came to be regarded as the representative schools of Protestant thought in Germany. Although very justly charged with holding extravagant theological views, and of having a haughty disdain for scientific acquirements, it can not be denied that the Pietists exercised a beneficial influence upon public morals and upon the theological tendencies of the age. The effects of this influence were especially conspicuous in the writings of *Buddeus* († 1729), whose theological works are more simple, and withal more scientific in treatment, than are those of any of the contemporaries of the same school.[1] The same may be said of *John Albert Bengel*[2] (1752), whose explanations of

[1] *Buddeus*, Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae, Jenae, 1723.

[2] *Bengel*, Novum Testamentum graece, in quo codd., verss. et editionn. describuntur, Tueb. 1734; his German translation of the N. T. claims to have rendered the original with the utmost fidelity (1753). *Gnomon N. T.*, in quo ex nativa verbor. vi simplicitas, profunditas, concinnitas, salubritas sensuum coelestium indicatur, Tueb. 1759, 4to, ed. IV. *Steudel*, Tueb. (1835) 1852. Cf.

Hosted by Google

Holy Scripture (*Gnomon Novi Testamenti*), while giving evidence of extensive learning, are pervaded by a spirit of warm devotional feeling. He was a hard and conscientious student of the original texts of Holy Writ, and was the *first to pave the way for the classification of the sacred manuscripts into families*; but the one aim of all his studies seemed to be to ascertain "the great day of the Lord," for, said he, "in the Scriptures the fulfillment of all time is the coming of Christ in glory" and "the breaking loose and binding of Satan." By calculations, based upon the Apocalypse, he computed that the world would endure for the space of $7777\frac{1}{9}$ years, and that "the breaking loose and the binding of Satan" would take place in the summer of 1836.[1] It is unnecessary to add that the event did not verify the prediction.

The speculative school of Bengel, represented by the Suabian prelate, *Oetinger*, and by *Fricker*, *Philip Matthew Hahn*, and *Michael Hahn*, subsequently coalesced with that of which *Jacob Boehm* was the recognized leader.

§ 377. *Abandonment of Symbols as Rules of Dogmatic Belief—Influence of Modern Philosophy, and its Consequences.*

Dorner, Hist. of Protestant Theology; Triumph of Subjectivism in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 673 et sq.

Not a few among the Protestants began to entertain serious doubts during the continuance of the conflicts just recounted as to the *binding force on the faithful of the dogmatic teaching set forth in the various books of symbols*. "It is indeed claimed," said the sceptics, "that dogmas have their sanction in Scripture; but, even so, are they not drawn out and expressed as conceived by the human intellect, which, inasmuch as it is limited by the extent of its historical and exegetical knowledge, is necessarily liable to be led into error? And if proof of this be demanded, we need only refer to the various changes made in the Augsburg Confession by Melanchthon himself,

Dorner, l. c., p. 648–662. *Kramer*, New Supplements toward the History of *A. H. Franke*, Halle, 1875.

[1] Ordo temporum a principio per periodos oeconomiae divinae historicus atque propheticus, Tuebingen, 1741. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

which were so numerous as to afford *Strobel* ample matter for a *literary history* of that document. Moreover, if the principle of free inquiry be once admitted, has not every one a right, is he not in a measure bound, to pursue the investigations already opened?" As Protestants had no satisfactory reply to give to this line of argument, their only logical course was to discard the symbols altogether, which many of them did. Their independent course made quite a stir, and subjected its participants to no little persecution. Driven, as Luther was, when his days were drawing to a close, to appeal to an infallible magisterial authority, the Consistories and the theologians, faithful themselves to the symbols, sought to force them upon all preachers and professors, and dismissed from their posts those who took leave to use in doctrinal inquiries the freedom of thought which was the vaunted birthright of all Reformers. This opposition, so contrary to the very genius of the Reformation, instead of checking the decline of Lutheran ecclesiasticism, which so many potent influences,[1] and notably *modern philosophy*,[2] were steadily undermining, only served to evoke more vehement and general *discussion on the books of symbols.*

Francis Bacon († 1626) had been directing men's minds to the study of physics and mathematics, and had raised the method of empiricism to the dignity of a law by making it a successful instrument of useful knowledge, but it must be said that in doing so he had no wish to divorce science from religion.[3] Whatever may be said of the defects of his moral

[1] *Walch*, New Hist. of Religion, Pt. II., p. 305–382; among the *Reformed*, *ibid.*, Pt. III., p. 285–298; in England, Pt. IV., p. 491–566. † *Dannenmayr*, Historia succincta controversiarum de auctoritate librorum symbolicor. inter Lutheranos, Frib. 1780. Cf. The Symbolical Books of the Protestant Church in Opposition to Scripture and Reason, Lps. 1836.

[2] Cfr. Modern Philosophy (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII.)

[3] After declaring that he prays the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity in all humility to heap fresh blessings on the human family through his labors, Bacon goes on to say: "Atque illud insuper supplices rogamus *ne humana divinis officiant;* neve *ex reseratione viarum sensûs*, et accensione majore luminis naturalis, *aliquid incredulitatis* et noctis animis nostris erga divina mysteria obori-

Hosted by Google

character, and, if the truth is to be told, they were multitudinous and flagrant, he can not be charged with a design of leading people into atheism. "*Leves gustus in philosophia,*" said he, "*movent fortassis ad atheismum, sed pleniores haustus ad religionem reducunt.*" [1] Sir *Isaac Newton*, who lived some time later († 1727), regarded the sciences as themselves a sort of revelation.

The philosophy of *Descartes*, which was more favorably received by Catholics than Protestants, entirely revolutionized theological methods. Men delighted, after the fashion of the Breton philosopher, to call in question the truth of all acquired knowledge, to doubt the conclusions of theology and the teachings of tradition, and by the unaided efforts of reason, which was a criterion of certitude to itself, arrive at a knowledge of the existence and perfections of God.

The reaction against the Cartesian method was as violent as the applause with which it was received had been enthusiastic. The Synod of Dordrecht (1656) enacted that theology should be completely severed from philosophy, and passed a number of decrees condemnatory of Cartesianism, which had now become suspected of having liberal political tendencies.[2] *Spinoza*,[3] though professedly a Christian, and starting with Christian principles, contributed largely to weaken faith in Christianity and to make men's minds familiar with ideas leading directly to pantheism; while *Locke* († 1704), making the experiences of the senses the test of truth, opened the way to a superficial empiricism. *Leibnitz* († 1716), the true representative of the learning, both secular and ecclesiastic,

atur." Praef. Instaur. Magn., quoted by *Dr. Newman*, Idea of a University, London, 1873, p. 118. (Tr.)

[1] Novum Organon scientiarum, 1620, ed. *Brück*, Lps. 1830. Opera omnia, Lond. 1859 sq. Cf., also, Corpus philosophor., ed. *Gfrörer*, Stuttg. 1831, T. I., and *Ritter*, Hist. of Philosophy, Vol. VIII.; *Bonn Periodical* of Philosophy and Catholic Theology, new series, year IV., nro. 2, p. 188 sq. *Michelis*, Hist. of Philosophy, p. 261, 262. *Kuno Fischer*, Bacon and his Followers, being a History of the Development of Empirical Philosophy, 2d edit., Lps. 1875.

[2] Cf., above, p. 517, note 1; also *Hock*, l. c., p. 112 sq., and *Freiburg* Eccles. Cyclop., Vol. II., p. 374; Fr. tr., Vol. 6, p. 218.

[3] Opera omnia, ed. *Paulus*, Jenae, 1802, 2 vols.; *Sigwart*, Spinozismus hist. et philos., Tueb. 1839. *Orelli*, The Life and Doctrine of Spinoza, Aarau, 1842.

Hosted by Google

of his age, as his days were drawing to a close, gave a sublime and almost Catholic exposition of the majestic truths of Christianity,[1] but to little purpose, as his influence on Protestant divines was well nigh inappreciable. Through the labors of *Wolf*[2] († 1754), his philosophy has been presented in a form intelligible to the ordinary mind. Wolf at first attempted to mathematically demonstrate the doctrines of the Church, but it soon became evident that he was endeavoring to put aside positive teaching altogether, and to substitute *natural religion* in its place; and he was all the more successful in this insidious design, in that the underlying principles of his new religion were derived from Christianity, though he was at great pains to conceal the real source from which they were taken.

This school produced a so-called *popular philosophy*, whose chief representatives were *Garve*, *Reimarus*, *Platner*, *Steinbart*, and *Mendelssohn*. In order, as they said, to have no guide but *sound reason*, they recast the philosophy of Wolf, stripping it entirely of its scholastic form. Henceforth the very idea of dogmatic Christianity was scouted, and even natural religion was a matter of grave doubt. Everything was based on *hypotheses*, so much so in fact that *Garve*, in a treatise on the existence of God, claimed for *theïsm* no more than the merit of being the best supported hypothesis advanced on the subject. These views were spread through the educational institutions of Germany by the writings of *John Bernard Basedow*, but chiefly by the pamphlet published by him at Leipsig in 1774, entitled *The Philanthropinon founded at Dessau*, giving a detailed account of the plan of this establishment, in which his idea of a model school was carried out. Something similar was attempted at Brunswick by his scholar, *Campe*, and by *Salzmann* at Schnepfenthal, near Gotha.[3] All these writers, while pompously laying claim to the title of

[1] Works, ed. by *Klopp. Guhrauer*, Godfrey William, Baron von Leibnitz, being a biography, Breslau, 1842, II. Pts. *Ritter*, Hist. of Philosophy, Vol. VIII. *Staudenmaier*, Leibnitz on Divine Revelation (Tueb. Quart., 1836); *Münst*, The Speculative Theology of Leibnitz (ibid., 1849). *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Vol. I., p. 311–337.

[2] *Wolf*, Theol. natur., Lips. 1736, 2 T., 4to. *Ritter*, Hist. of Philos., Vol. VIII.

[3] *Charles von Raumer*, Hist. of Pedagogy, Pt. II., p. 242 sq.

Hosted by Google

philosophers, were in fact only smart sophists; and when *Kant* appeared and gave to Protestantism, which had now neither a creed nor dogmatic teaching, the philosophy of *Kantism*, they were nearly stupified with amazement, and were no longer heard of. The influence of Wolf's philosophy on theology became apparent when the *Wertheim translation of the Bible*[1] was published. The work bears upon it the characteristic marks of this school, the aim of the editors being to depreciate biblical teaching and to cast suspicion upon the divine prophecies, a method of treatment which, it was said, the requirements of modern criticism demanded. The translation was suppressed within the States of the Empire by imperial decree in 1737; but had it made its appearance fifty years later, it would have been hailed with universal applause.

The Naturalism then in vogue among the English Freethinkers, and which was the legitimate product of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, was introduced into Germany, and propagated with a fierce energy little short of satanic. An association of the advocates of Conscience, calling themselves *Conscientiarians*, was formed, and its principles widely propagated by *Matthew Knutzen*, a sort of itinerant preacher from Holstein († 1764), who embodied them in popular tracts, which he circulated among the masses. He was followed in the same field by *Edelmann* († 1767),[2] who, from the year 1735 onward, wrote many violent works against Christianity, maintaining in rude but vigorous language, and with an air of imperturbable audacity, "that the Christian Korân, being quite as inconsistent with itself and as unauthentic as the Turkish, should be rejected; that, putting aside the fable of Christ, man, after the pattern of *Enoch* and *Noah*, should depend on reason alone, which is the *conscience* nature, like a provident mother, has set in the breast of all human beings to teach them to live uprightly, to harm no one, and to render unto every one what is his due; that this is the

[1] Cf. *Walch*, Religious Disputes, Vol. V.

[2] Cf. Acta hist. eccl., Vol. IV., p. 436; Vol. VI., p. 292; Vol. XII., p. 119; Vol. XVIII., p. 957 sq. See also **W. Elster*, Remembrance of John Chr. Edelmann in reference to Dr. David Fred. Strauss, Clausthal, 1839.

Hosted by Google

true Bible, and any one making light of it offers an insult to his own manhood; that there is neither God nor devil, neither Heaven nor hell, except as they are created by the individual conscience; that the birth of Christ from a Virgin, His resurrection, etc., are fabulous tales; that marriage and fornication are equally estimable; and that priests, kings, and all magistrates whatever should be swept from the face of the earth." No one contributed more than *Frederic II.* to spread these teachings in Germany. He was the patron and constant correspondent of Voltaire, d'Argens, la Mettrie, and other French philosophers; received them at his court, and made the infidel works of their country fashionable among the upper classes of society. The *General German Library* (1764–1806), a literary review, edited by *Nicolaï*, also contributed powerfully to strengthen and encourage the spirit of irreligion that seemed to be leading the intellect of the world into bondage. For the first ten years of its existence it was the supreme literary tribunal of Germany, and as such its pages were open to laudatory notices of works hostile, not alone to faith, but to every noble sentiment and spiritual aspiration. The *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*,[1] composed by *Reimarus* († 1768), and collected and published by Lessing, were bitterly hostile to the whole teaching of Christianity, and exercised a potent influence in unsettling the convictions of many minds. In these the work of Christ is represented as an abortive attempt at revolt, His resurrection denied, and revelation declared impossible.

What Nicolaï and Lessing did for the upper classes was

[1] 1. On the disparagement of human reason by the preachers; 2. On the impossibility of a divine revelation; 3. On the improbability of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea; 4. On the Old Testament—not written as a religious revelation; 5. On the falsity of the resurrection. (Historical and Literary Essays found among the Treasures of the Library of Wolfenbüttel; 3d and 4th Essays, Wolfenbüttel, 1777; On the Aim of Jesus and His Disciples, Brunswick, 1778.) Fragment by the Unknown of Wolfenbüttel, edited by Lessing, 4th ed., Berlin, 1835. Cf. Acta histor. ecclesiast. nostri temp., T. V., pp. 711 et sq.; also *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., art. *Fragments*. *Fred. Strauss*, Reimarus and His Apology for the Rational Worshipers of God. Lps. 1862.

Hosted by Google

done for the lower by *Barhdt*,[1] who, after having been successively a lecturer on theology at Leipsig, Erfurt, and Giessen, and the director of a benevolent society at Halle, finally closed his career of debauchery as an *innkeeper* in 1792. It would be difficult to find an author more wicked and trifling than Bahrdt; more intent upon destroying the authenticity of the Bible narrative by inventing absurd hypotheses to explain away its contents; and more eager to banish the teachings of the Church from the minds and hearts of the people, and to supply their place with an empty rationalism. But, though utterly despicable and worthless, he was either candid or shameless enough to avow that if the orthodox Protestants had paid him equally well he would have been equally zealous in the advocacy of their cause. The works of *Wünsch* and *Venturini* were of the same character, the former representing Christ as the victim of His own delusions, and the latter speaking of His life as a silly romance. *Mauvillon*,[2] though more learned, was not less wicked and energetic in his assaults upon the origin and ethics of Christianity.

§ 378. *Biblical Theologians—The False Enlightenment of Neologism—Classical Literature of Germany.*

Tholuck, Hist. Sketch of the Extreme Confusion of Theology in Germany since 1750 (*Miscellanea*, Vol. II., p. 1–147). The Self-destruction of Protestantism, Schaffh. 1843, 2 vols. *Ficker*, A Critical History of Rationalism from the French of *Saintes*, Lps. 1845.

The bulk of the people had given up all faith in the church as a teacher of divine truth. Neither did they any longer believe with the first Reformers that the Sacred Books were inspired and possessed characteristics *so essentially their own as to distinguish them* by unmistakable signs from all profane literature whatever.[3] Hence the more weighty theologians set

[1] Cf. Hist. of His Life by Himself, Berlin, 1794, 4 vols.; and *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., pp. 583 sq.; French trans., Vol. 2, p. 259 sq.

[2] The Only True System of the Christian Religion, Berlin, 1787.

[3] *Wetstein*, Prolegomena in N. T. (1751): Nov. Testament., Amst. 1752, 2 T., f. He quotes in his explanations a good many sentiments of classic antiquity, as supposed parallel passages to those of the Bible. Accordingly, he puts in the same line the passage of St. Matthew, vi. 34: "Be not solicitous about to-mor-

Hosted by Google

about giving a more liberal, independent, and individual exposition of Christianity, thereby adjusting it to the new spirit now predominant in biblical studies. *Cocceius* († 1669) had early introduced this method by giving a purely biblical exposition of dogmatic teaching, in which he made no reference to the formularies of faith promulgated by ecclesiastical authority;[1] but the true founders of this school were *Hugo Grotius* and the Arminian, *Wetstein*, the latter of whom, having been banished from his native city of *Basle*, was then living in exile in the Netherlands († 1754). Its first advocate in Germany was *John David Michaëlis*,[2] from the year 1754 a professor at Göttingen († 1801). He was an ardent student of profane history, archaeology, and the Oriental languages, though by no means so well informed as *Baumgarten* and *Ernesti*, who aimed at adjusting the study of theology with that of profane philology.[3] So far these men had made no direct and overt attack upon religion; they simply ignored the authority of all ecclesiastical teaching, professing to derive their doctrines from the Scriptures as the sole fountain of all truth. But, as always happens, the disciples went beyond the bounds set by their masters. Among the better known of the *rationalists* of the second generation were *Semler* (1725–1791), the pupil of Baumgarten; *Morus*, the pupil of Ernesti; and *Koppe* and *Eichhorn*, the pupils of Michaëlis and the compilers of the theological *neology*. The most dangerous of these was Semler,[4] who, like Michaëlis, had been

row," etc., and the Epicurean saying of *Horace:* "Carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero," or "Laetus in praesens animus, quod ultra est, oderit curare, et amara lento temperet risu; nihil est ab omni parte beatum." (Odar. lib. I., 11, 8, and lib. II., 16, 25–28.) But hereupon *Olearius* made the pointed remark: *Verbis* igitur, non *sensu* plerasque illas sententias cum salutari Salvatoris doctrina conspirare arbitramur.

[1] Summa doctrina de foedere et Testamento Dei, Lug. Bat. 1648. *Alberti*, Cartesius et Coccejus descripti et refutati, ibid. 1678, 4to.

[2] His autobiography, with Remarks, by *Hassenkamp*, Rinteln and Lps. 1793. **Introd.* to the O. and N. T.; The *Mosaic Right*, etc.

[3] *J. v. Voorst*, Orat. de Ernest. optimo post Grot. duce interpret. N. T., Lugd. Batav. 1804, 4to. *Ernesti*, Institutio interpretis N. T.; last edition by *Ammon*.

[4] Concerning *Semler*, *Eichhorn*, and the rest mentioned above, cf. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., under their respective names, and *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 701 sq.

Hosted by Google

educated in the pietistic school of Halle, where he received impressions that revived in his declining years. He was the intimate friend of Baumgarten's, by whose eloquence he was captivated, and who, recognizing his splendid talents, committed to him the office of reforming theology. "I am now too far advanced in years," said the master; "yours is the duty of taking upon you this task." Semler, while gifted with a tenacious memory, an acute mind, and a glowing imagination, was destitute of those philosophical habits of thought necessary to the work he was to undertake; and hence he made the mistake of putting the claims of the *Church*, which he regarded as partly immaterial to his purpose and partly a positive incumbrance to it, entirely out of sight. To him her brightest days were overcast with darkness. But, strange to say, he never seemed conscious of the character of the revolution he was effecting; and when, in 1779, it was completely triumphant, and he saw to what lengths it was carried by the impious and immoral Bahrdt, he was startled at his own work; and, taking alarm, sought in subsequent writings to correct his mistakes, maintaining that *religion* was of a twofold nature, viz., *public* and *private;* public, in that some sort of worship should be legally established and upheld in inviolable integrity; private, in that the individual should be free to hold or reject whatever he saw fit. Semler's revolution was the legitimate outcome of his *exegetical method* and the result of his singular criticism of the Old Testament. Starting with the correct rule that the Scriptures should be interpreted according to the language in which they were written, and with due allowances for the circumstances of place and time, he further held that they should be subject to the same rules of criticism and interpretation as any other book, and that no account should be taken of their divine character. Hence he maintained that some things in Holy Scripture being peculiar to the localities in which the objectionable passages containing them were written, should be accordingly restricted in their application, and that the myths, which he pretended to discover, should be rejected. This method rendered necessary the rejection of many books enumerated in the Old Testament canon. Again, by grouping

Hosted by Google

the leading and dominating facts of Christianity, so as to restrict them to certain specified periods of time, he stripped them of that character of universality which makes them applicable to all times and places; and by endeavoring to show that the New Testament was throughout only an effort at *adjusting* certain principles and views to Jewish notions and prejudices, he professed to believe that the teachings of Christ were truths of a general character only, and having no special and definite import of their own.

Finally, he maintained that the Bible contained nothing of value except its *moral teaching*, and that all else was useless in the Christian Church, thus narrowing down Christianity to a few ethical rules destitute of any authoritative sanction. In this way Semler, by a long and laborious historical process, arrived at the same conclusion that the popular philosophers had reached by a short cut, viz., that the Bible is only valuable as a moral guide.

The theologians of the various universities now gradually classified themselves into *three* parties; some contending for loyalty to the *orthodox teaching of the symbols*; others, while preserving the *form of biblical faith*, depreciating the necessity and importance of dogmatic teaching, and declaring that an ethical code was the one thing essential; and others, again, *openly assailing all revealed dogma*, thus fully developing the system of Semler.

By the side of the university theologians there arose a school of popular philosophers, including such names as *Mendelssohn*, *Engel*, *Nicolaï*, and *Sulzer*, who were acting in harmony with *Spalding*, *Jerusalem*, *Eberhardt*, and *Teller*, then the most distinguished theologians of Berlin, and with a society founded in that city by the Librarian, *Biester*, known as the "*Society for the Diffusion of Light and Truth*," and the aim of which was proclaimed to be the subversion of all usurped and tyrannical authority, the reformation of religion, and the substitution of a code of morals instead of dogmatic teaching, as the basis of religious worship. Such is the system elaborated by *Teller* in his German Dictionary of the New Testament, published in 1772; but, strange to say, he so far forgot himself as

Hosted by Google

to assume the *perfectibility of Christianity*.[1] These excesses were in a measure restrained by the *edict of Woellner, the Prussian minister*, issued in the interest of orthodoxy in the year 1788.

Finally, the revival of *classical literature*, then ardently cultivated in Germany, particularly by the Protestants, when not positively hostile to Christianity, was not in sympathy with it. Among the leaders of this revival were some theologians of greatest name.

Lessing (1729–1781),[2] whom his father had destined for a student of divinity, disliking the study, devoted himself to letters, and was subsequently appointed Librarian of Wolfenbüttel. Without professing to be a theologian, he revived a partial taste for the study of divinity, which he pursued as an amateur, and published the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, "in order," as he said, "to humble those overbearing orthodox theologians, and to show them how untenable were their arguments." "But," he added, "while aiming a blow at the scientific pretensions of theologians, I do not wish to disturb the faith of Christians." Basing himself, like Semler, upon historical grounds, he maintained that just as there is a natural law so also is there a *natural religion*, and that as the former assumes a positive character when men begin to live together in society, so also does the latter, it being necessary to come to some understanding on details no less than on general principles. He also held that all religions, whether *positive* or revealed, were *equally true* and *equally false*, putting this

[1] Religion of the Perfect, Berlin, 1792.

[2] On the Origin of Revealed Religion; *Nathan*, A Parable, accompanied with an Humble Petition and a Letter of Final Retractation; A Necessary Answer to a very Unnecessary Question put by Head-Pastor Goetze; Anti-Goetze, 1778. (The first complete edition of his works appeared in 30 vols., Berlin, 1771–1794), and an excellent edition was edited by Lachmann (13 vols., Berlin, 1838–1840). See Vols. 10 and 11 of this ed. *Schwarz*, Lessing as a Theologian. Halle, 1854. *Boden*, Lessing and Goetze, Lps. and Heidelbg. 1863. *Staudenmaier*, Protestantism, etc., Vol. II., p. 227 sq. *Wolfgang Menzel*, German Poetry, Vol. III., p. 147 sq. G. E. Lessing's Life and Works, 1859, translated into English by *E. P. Evans*, 2 vols., Boston, 1866. *Nathan der Weise*, tr. by *Dr. Reich*, 1860, and *Ellen Frothingham*, 1867. An English translation of his "Education of the Human Race," London, 1858. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

sentiment into the mouth of his character of *Nathan the Wise:* "It is now as difficult to ascertain which ring is the true one as to demonstrate now which is the true faith."[1] The profound aim of his work on the *Education of the Human Race*, addressed alike to scholars and to men of less cultivated intellects, is to withdraw mankind from a shallow and superficial naturalism. The scope of the heated discussion which he carried on with *Goetze*, the Lutheran Head-Pastor of Hamburg, was to show how the theologians, who had set aside *tradition*, had rashly and wantonly, from very fear of tradition, rejected truths without properly investigating them or trying them by the laws of true criticism. Lessing said he had rather have one Pope in Rome than countless petty Lutheran popes in Germany. Yet he was so many-sided in his opinions that his authority has been recently invoked by Twesten in favor of orthodoxy, and by Schwarz in support of rationalism.

Herder (1744–1803),[2] in his apologetical works, regarded Christianity more as *a creation of marvelous beauty* than as the one appointed means for the salvation of fallen man. Invited to Weimar in 1775 by the Grand Duke, on the recommendation of Goethe, he was appointed court-preacher and consistorial councillor, and the growing reputation of his splendid talents soon brought him into contact with the most distinguished authors, and gave him a place in the foremost rank of German poets. But his morbid vanity was not proof against the insidious homage of flattery; his faith gradually gave way; and in the end his only ambition seemed to be to cover with contempt whatever his contemporaries held in honor. One by one the truths of Christianity were rejected; the teachings of the Gospel seemed veiled from his sight; his thoughts became obscure; and there was no longer any trace of positive doctrine to be found in his writings. Hence *John von Müller*, speaking of his otherwise esteemed work, *Outlines*

[1] This refers to a passage in Lessing's Drama, *Nathan the Wise*, Act. III., Sc. VII. (Tr.)

[2] Christian Works, in five collections, Riga and Lps. 1794 sq. Religious and Theological Works, published by *G. Müller*, Tuebingen, 1805 sq., 10 vols. Cf. *Hagenbach*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 3d ed., Pt. II., p. 1–87; and *Gelzer*, Modern German National Literature, Vol. I., p. 329.

Hosted by Google

of a Philosophy of the History of Man, says: "I find there everything except Christ; but what is the History of the world without Christ?" To Herder's mind Christ was only "the well-beloved of Jehovah." The want of consistency in his writings may be accounted for by the fact that his point of view was successively changed to suit the *chronological* sequence of the subjects under treatment as they came up one by one.

As these theologians, philosophers, philologists, and exegetical writers raised a multitude of questions in their works, without answering any, they left many minds dissatisfied, many hearts craving for comfort, and many souls weighed down with sorrow and yearning for better things. This explains the sympathetic approbation with which the simple and pious utterances of *Gellert* (1715–1769) were received; and the warm admiration that greeted the appearance (1748) of *Klopstock's Messias*, which, unlike Dante's immortal work, was not reared upon the everlasting foundation of the truths of Christian dogma, and could never have evoked such expressions of religious feeling as it did had there not existed deep down in the human heart an abiding belief in God and a hopeful trust in the Incarnation, which no amount of cold infidelity could entirely obscure or extinguish. *Hamann*, that prophetic thinker, who styled himself the *Magician of the North* (1730–1788),[1] and the popular writer, *Claudius* (1743–1815), were authors of more solidity than Klopstock and Gellert, and each achieved success in his own way and degree; the former among a limited and select class of readers, and the latter among a wider circle of followers, to whom he recommended the works of Fenelon.[2] Both witty and humorous, Claudius was unsparing in his ridicule of the false enlightenment of his assailants, representing them at

[1] Biographical Memorial of John Hamann, Münster, 1855. *Herbst*, Library of Christian Thinkers, Lps. 1830, Vol. I. *Petri*, The Works and Correspondence of Hamann, until 1873, already three parts. *Gildemeister*, J. G. Hamann, the Magus of the North, his Life and Works, Gotha, 1875, 3 vols.

[2] Concerning *Claudius* and *Lavater*, see *Herbst*, l. c., Vol. II. Claudius' Organ was the *Wandsbecker Bote* (Wandsbeck Messenger). Cfr. supra, p. 520, note 1.

Hosted by Google

one time as *Goliahs* and again as *Pigmies*. Philosophy could command his respect only in so far as it created in man a love for the true and the good; "for," said he, "if these be not esteemed in man, what is there else in him to esteem?"

Lavater (1741–1801), *Jung-Stilling* (1740–1817), and *Oberlin*, of Alsace, all of the Reformed Church, expressed a genuine admiration of the blessings of Christianity. *Wieland* (1733–1813), while under the influence of the writings of Klopstock, gave himself up to a sort of mystical piety, foreign to his nature, from which, however, he soon broke loose, and became atheistical in thought, and advocated, if he did not practice, a lax code of morals.

The writings of *Goethe* (1749–1832),[1] who labored to cultivate among his contemporaries a taste for Pagan literature and a love of the classic creations of the Greek mind, contributed powerfully to extinguish the spirit of reviving faith. All the faculties of his splendid genius were concentrated on the one task of putting nature in the place of God. He detested both religion and politics, because, he said, their influence was fatal to art. Finally, *Schiller* (1759–1805), in his *Gods of Greece*, expressed his regret that, to give adequate glory to the One God of the Christians, the gods of Olympus should be sacrificed:

> "And to enrich the worship of the *One*
> A Universe of Gods must pass away."

He then invoked the return of the happy age of Nature:

> "Return, thou virgin-bloom on Nature's face."

He declared that he professed no religion *for religion's sake*. This is certainly a convenient way of working out one's salvation without "fear and trembling," and led the poet to indulge the hope expressed in his Hymn of Joy:

> *All sin shall be forgiven,*
> *And Hell shall cease to be.*

---

[1] *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Vol. II., p. 361–383. The better elements in Goethe and Schiller are pointed out by *Daumer*, My Conversion, Mentz, 1859, pp. 66 and 119 sq. Cf. *Hagenbach*, Ch. H. of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, Pt. II., p. 113–138. We quote the first two of Schiller's passages from his Poems and Ballads, as transl. by Sir *Edw. Bulwer-Lytton*, Bart., New York, pp. 299 and 300. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

§ 379. *The Herrnhutters.*

Zinzendorf, Actual Form of the Cross of Christ in Its Simplicity, Lps. (1745), 4to. Περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, or Natural Reflections (1746), 4to. Twenty-one Discourses on the Augsburg Confession, 1747–1748; The Brothers' Hymn Book. *Jeremias*, or Sermon on Sanctification, new ed., Berlin, 1830. Tracts, Frkft. 1740. *Spangenberg*, Life of Count Zinzendorf (Barby), 1772 sq., 8 vols. *Varnhagen von Ense*, Life of Count Zinzendorf (Biographical Monuments, Vol. V.) *Tholuck*, Miscellanea, Hamburg, 1839, Vol. I. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Book II. *Herzog*, Cyclopaedia, Vol. XVIII., p. 508–592. *Plitt*, The Theology of Zinzendorf, Gotha, 1869, Vol. I.

The sect of the Herrnhutters or United Brethren were animated with the spirit of Spener and Franke, and were an outgrowth of the Moravian Brethren. They first consisted of a number of families, who, wishing to dwell in a Protestant country, quitted their old homes and settled on the estate of Count *Louis von Zinzendorf* (1700–1760), near Berthelsdorf. In the year 1722 they built themselves houses at the foot of the Hutberg, or the Watch Hill, near the count's residence, but subsequently the name was changed into *Herrnhut*, or the Watch of the Lord, whence they derive their appellation. The count, who, with his friends, *Frederic von Watteville* and *Spangenberg*, had been brought up in the Pietistic school of Halle, by the enforcement of a rigorous discipline, and what was styled "The *Cross and Blood Theology*," succeeded in introducing some sort of unity into the heterogeneous elements of which the new community was made up. He brought the members to accept a constitution containing what were called "*The Fundamental Articles*," and divided them into three principal classes or tropes, viz., the *Moravians*, the *Reformed*, and the *Lutheran*. These sectaries have always been distinguished by a spirit of pride, which has been the fruitful source of fresh divisions. The *bloody death of Christ upon the Cross* has been at all times their one cardinal point of doctrine, and the one unfailing subject of their sermons, hymns, and other writings, which are remarkable for quaintness of expression and a singularity of imagery more fanciful than just, the similes employed being very unusual, frequently extravagant, and at times even inde-

Hosted by Google

cent.[1] While professing the most implacable hostility for Lutheran scholasticism, as fettering the free and expansive spirit of devotion, they fell insensibly into a formalism still more slavish and barren.

The system of government among the Herrnhutters was nearly the same as that of the United Brethren (*Unitas Fratrum*) of the fifteenth century, whose name they also adopted. Their officers were of three classes, viz., deacons, elders, and bishops, though the last enjoyed no special prerogatives. They were divided into congregations, and each congregation again into *choirs*, according to age, sex, and kinship by marriage. Into the congregations no one was admitted except those designated as the *Awakened*, and accordingly the sluggish were brought to a sense of duty by discipline of various kinds; but if they still continued incorrigible, they were entirely cut off from membership. Each settlement was under the immediate government of a conference, consisting of its officers; and the whole community was governed by a permanent conference, composed of the elders, and the sessions of which were held at Berthelsdorf. Every four, ten, or twelve years, as convenience or exigency might require, the Conference of Elders called a *General Synod*, in which all matters of importance were transacted; but all questions that could not be satisfactorily disposed of by human judgment and foresight were decided by lot.

As years went on, a spirit of worldliness and commercial enterprise found its way among the Herrnhutters, and en-

[1] *J. Stinstra*, in his "Warning against Fanaticism" (transl. from the Dutch into German, Berlin, 1752), gives a compilation of them. Zinzendorf once led off the choir of his congregation in the following style:

"Du Raethsel der Vernunft
Du Thohu vehabohu (darkness, chaos)
Von der gesammten Zunft
Der Blutlichtscheuen Uhu;
Du Wunder aller Wunder
Mixtura inconfusa
Du bist's, der mir gefaellt,
Dein Gnadenstuhl frass Usa."

(II. Kings, vi. 3); *Buchmann*, Popular Symbolism, 2d ed., Mentz, 1844, Vol. I., p. 8–10.

Hosted by Google

feebled, if it did not quite extinguish, their early religious fervor. One good, however, these communities accomplished: they afforded in an age of growing infidelity a peaceable asylum to such Protestants as still valued faith in the divinity of Christ as a precious pearl, and a treasure of inestimable price to fallen and redeemed man.

§ 380. *The Quakers.*

History of the Life, Travels, and Sufferings of George Fox, London, 1691. *Robert Barclay*, Theol. vere christ. Apolog., Amst. 1676, 4to, and often. *Penn*, Summary of the Hist., Doctr., and Discipl. of Friends, 1692, edit. 6th, London, 1707, with notes by *Seebohm*, Pyrmont (1792) 1798. (Tr. adds:) Rules of Discipline of the Soc. of Friends, London, 1783, ed. 3, 1834. *G. Croesii*, Hist. Quakeriana, Amst. (1695) 1704. *Alberti*, Account of the Rel. of the Q., Han. 1750. *Gough*, Hist. of the People called Quakers, Dublin, 1789, 4 vols. *F. Clarkson*, Portraiture of Quakerism, London, 1806, 3 vols. *H. Tuke*, Principles of Religion, as held by Christians commonly called Quakers; in Germ. and Engl., Lond. and Lps. 1828. *J. J. Gurney*, Observations on the Society of Friends, London, 1824, ed. 7, 1834. *W. Sewell*, Hist. of the Quakers, London and New York, 1840, 2 vols. *W. R. Wagstaff*, Hist. of the Soc. of Friends, New York, 1836. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Pt. II., ch. II.

George Fox, a cobbler, who was born in Drayton, a village of Leicestershire, in 1624, and died in 1690, is generally regarded as the real founder of the *Quakers*.[1] He professed to believe that all saving truth and religious consciousness are the immediate effect of the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, who *in the day of His coming* floods the soul of man with an *interior light*, which is the light of Christ. Neither exterior revelation nor Scripture itself can supply the place of this interior illumination; on the contrary, Scripture being an inferior revelation, requires this light to make clear its sense. It alone adequately confirms revelations, produces *true knowledge*, is the vivifying principle of religious life, and the nourisher of sincere piety. The teaching of the Quakers on *justification*, sanctification, the Sacramental system, and the perfect fulfillment of the Law is but a logical deduction from the fundamental principle. They hold that the Sacra-

[1] For a good account of the lawless and indecent extravagancies of this sect before it was joined by Penn and other men of culture, see *Blunt*, Dict. of Heresies and Sects, art. "Quakers." (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

ments are only external forms and ceremonies, and of themselves possess no efficacy. Every Christian is both a teacher and a preacher, and to preach and to teach are offices of no *special* character. Prayer is the spontaneous expression of the soul, and hence should not be fettered by any fixed and prescribed formulary.

They refuse, from conscientious motives, to render military service, to take oaths, to pay taxes, to indulge in games either of hazard or amusement, to permit music of any kind, to frequent theaters or plays, to read profane poetry treating of love and romance, and dancing of every sort is most rigorously prohibited among them. Such salutations as "Your Majesty," "Your Lordship," "Your Honor," and the like, they say have a flavor of arrogance and a vain and worldly spirit, ill becoming a Christian; while greetings and subscriptions like "Your humble Servant" they characterize as hypocritical. To lift the hat, to remain uncovered, to address another in the plural number they hold to be sinful. They never try to right a wrong or seek redress before a secular court, nor do they lay a charge against any one for any offense whatsoever.

William Penn (1644–1718), who had embraced Quakerism while a student at Christ Church, Oxford, after many trials, finally determined to provide a home in the New World for himself and his co-religionists, where they would be permitted to follow out their religious convictions unmolested. In the year 1681 he obtained from the crown, in lieu of a monetary claim, a portion of land on the *Delaware*, in what is now the State of Pennsylvania, and in the following year sailed from England, with several friends, and on the 30th of November of the same year had his famous interview with the Indians where now stands the town of Kensington. He planted a colony, more than half the inhabitants of which were Quakers, laid out the city of Philadelphia, and established toleration by law. This colony long continued to be an asylum for those who suffered persecution for their religious convictions in other parts of the country.

In England the Quakers were granted, in 1686, the same toleration enjoyed by other Dissenters. They are now everywhere rapidly decreasing in numbers. In Holland there are still a few congregations; in England they are daily losing ground; in Northern Germany they have nearly ceased to exist, there being but one congregation of them established at Friedrichsthal, near Pyrmont, in Hanover, in 1791. The Quakers have probably never exceeded two hundred thousand in number, and at the present time more than half of them reside in the United States, where, since the year 1827, they have been split into the two parties of the "*Orthodox*" and the "*Hicksites.*" They organized a missionary society in 1868, and have since established missions in India and Madagascar. Uniformly opposed to slavery, they have been the constant friends of both the freedman and the Indian. Of late years they have relaxed somewhat of their primitive severity, and are now more liberal in their views, particularly with regard to the arts of painting, sculpture, and music.

Hosted by Google

The name Quaker is etymologically derived from the verb to quake, and was first applied to them derisively, "because they often trembled under the awful sense of the infinite purity and majesty of God."

Other accounts are given of its historical origin, the most correct being, in all probability, that which refers the name to a circumstance in their early religious exercises; for, when the inspiration of the Spirit took place, the fact was revealed to those present by convulsions and shaking.[1]

§ 381. *The Methodists—Theological Literature in England.*

Hampson, Mem. of Wesley, and Hist. of Methodism, London, 1791, 3 vols.; ed. in Germ., Halle, 1793; Life of G. Whitefield, Edinburgh, 1826; edited after the English, by *Tholuck*, in Germ., Lps. 1834. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Pt. II., ch. III., sections 75 and 76. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 513 sq. Transl. adds: The works of J. Wesley, Bristol, 1771 sq., 32 vols. *R. Southey*, Life of J. Wesley, and the Rise and Progress of Methodism, ed. 3, Lond. 1846, 2 vols. *H. More*, Life of J. Wesley, London, 1824 sq., 2 vols. *J. Gillies*, Memoirs of G. Whitefield, Hartford, 1835. *R. Philip*, Life and Times of G. Whitefield, London, 1837; New York, 1838. *J. G. Burckhard*, Complete Hist. of Methodism in England, Nürnberg, 1795, 2 vols. *J. Crowther*, Portraiture of Methodism, London, 1815. *J. W. Baum*, Methodism, Zürich, 1838. *T. Jackson*, Hist. of the Commencement, Progress, and Present State of Methodism, London, 1838. *Isaac Taylor*, Wesley and Methodism, London, 1851. *J. Whitehead*, Lives of John and Charles Wesley, London, 1793, 2 vols. Doc. and Hist. Invest. of Meth. in its Connectional Prin. and Pol., 2d ed., London, 1852. Minutes of Conferences in Engl. from 1744 to 1824, London, 1824, 5 vols. *S. Warren*, Chronicles and Digest of Laws, etc., of Meth., Lond. 1827, 2 vols. *Abel Stevens*, Hist. of the Rel. Movement called Methodism, New York, 1861. *Geo. Smith*, Hist. of Meth., 1862, 3 vols. *L. Tyerman*, The Oxford Methodists, London, 1873. *W. P. Strickland*, Hist. of the Missions of the Meth. Ep. Church, Cincinnati, 1850. *R. Watson*, Theological Institutes, with an Analysis by *J. McClintock*. *Wm. F. Warren*, Systematische Theologie einheitlich behandelt, Bremen, 1865. For a complete bibliography of Methodism down to 1865, see the above work of Dr. Warren.

John Wesley, while a student of Christ Church, Oxford, formed a little association, composed of piously inclined students (1729), who, because of the gravity of their demeanor and the severe formality of their manners, were called by their fellow-students *methodists* or the *Club of the Saints*. Such

[1] After having accepted the name given them by popular impulse, they set about proving its fitness to express sanctity. Thus Naylor, the forerunner of Fox, in a work published in 1653, proceeds to show how "that the earth quaked and trembled; that Isaac trembled exceedingly; that Moses feared and quaked; that the Lord bade His disciples quake for fear; and that therefore saints ought to be Quakers." *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects and Heresies, art. "Quakers." (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

was the beginning of a great religious movement, whose influence has been most potent in England and the United States. Minds that had been unduly and fanatically excited by the events of the great political and religious revolutions through which England had passed, now that the incentives that had kept them at fervid heat were no longer in action, became as cold in devotion and as sceptical in belief as they had formerly been credulous and ardent. Infidelity was daily gaining ground, and moral depravity was steadily on the increase. The Anglican clergy, who should have been the teachers of truth and the custodians of morals, contemplated the advancing evils with indifference, or possibly thought themselves helpless to make head against so colossal a danger. The disease was rapidly eating into the vital parts of the nation, and it seemed that the whole body would become infected unless prompt and energetic treatment were applied. People were anxiously looking about them for men of strong faith and stout hearts to come forth and denounce sin and preach penance. It is not wonderful, then, that when *John Wesley* and his brother, *Charles*, and the eloquent and gentle *Whitefield* (from 1732) fulfilled in some sort these conditions in their ministry, they should be received with favor, and gain numerous proselytes to Methodism. The new sect, too, had a character peculiarly its own, distinguishing it from the various jarring and conflicting parties into which the Church of England was split, and this note of individuality was a potent element of its success.

Wesley, through intercourse with the Herrnhutters, some of whom were his companions on a voyage he made to America in 1735, was very favorably impressed with their teachings and practices, and, with a view to obtain a more accurate knowledge of their organization, visited their communities in Germany and Holland in 1738, in company with *Spangenberg*. This is also about the date when he began to hold *the doctrine that the presence of divine grace in the soul and the consciousness of the remission of sin are indicated by strong religious feelings, manifesting themselves externally in convulsive movements of the body*. While attending a meeting of one of the Moravian societies, May 24, 1738, in Aldersgate street, London,

Hosted by Google

he experienced such an entire change during the reading of Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans, that he ever after regarded this as the moment of his conversion, which, he tells us, with a commendable desire to be accurate in affairs of such import, took place at precisely fifteen minutes before nine o'clock. "I felt," he said, "my heart strangely warmed; that I trusted in Christ and Christ alone for salvation; that He had taken away my sins; and that I was *saved* from the law of sin and death." It is characteristic of this state, he assures us, that whoever has personal experience of it is forthwith lifted into a purer and more serene spiritual atmosphere, out of reach of the disorderly movements of the flesh and beyond the unruly annoyances of sense, and is so constituted as to enjoy complete *exemption from sin.*

Although retaining the form, organization, liturgy, and symbol of the Anglican Church, the community founded by Wesley was distinguished from it by an austere *asceticism*, which displayed itself in numerous and rigorous fasts, in special prayers at stated hours, in the assiduous reading of the Bible, and in a frequent approach to the communion table. Such was the zeal and enthusiasm of *Whitefield* and other apostles of Methodism that its teaching spread rapidly, both in England and North America.

The Methodists had no desire to separate from the Established Church, and did not formally do so until forced to take the step by the jealousy and uneasiness of the orthodox ministers. Wesley having himself never been consecrated, in 1784 assumed the office of a bishop, and began to ordain ministers and make bishops for the special and exclusive service of the Methodist community. From this time forth the Methodists saw themselves engaged in a conflict with the Established Church on the one hand, and with the Herrnhutters on the other. Apart from the keen personal rivalry of Zinzendorf and Wesley, during the lifetime of the former, there was a wide divergence of opinion between the two sects they represented on the doctrines of grace and regeneration. Even Wesley and Whitefield could not agree on the questions of grace and predestination, and separated as early as 1740; the former adopting the views of *Calvin;* the latter those of

Hosted by Google

Arminius, though the following of Wesley was much the more numerous of the two. Wesley was not a little startled to learn that, in spite of his honest efforts to improve the lives of his adherents, *antinomian principles* had found favor among them, and were developing a frightful state of immorality, and he concluded that the teachings of Calvin held too prominent a place in his system.

Fletcher,[1] a disciple of Wesley's, endeavored to draw out still more distinctly and precisely the points of difference between the Wesleyans and the followers of Whitefield, and at a conference held in 1771, and presided over by Wesley in person, the questions in dispute were discussed and defined.

The elements of the organization of the Methodist community are: 1. *Bands*, composed of from five to ten persons each, who, under the direction of a leader, meet *voluntarily* once a week to examine the state of their consciences, confess their sins publicly, and thus keep alive an abiding sense of guilt. 2. *Classes*, composed of from ten to thirty persons, who are *required* to meet once a week and tell their individual "experience" during the preceding week. A number of these classes make up a "*society*" or congregation, and to one of them every Methodist must necessarily belong. 3. *Circuits*, consisting of a number of "societies" or congregations, having some considerable town or city as a center, and including the out-lying country to a radius of some ten or twelve miles. Each of these circuits has from one to five ministers, technically called "traveling preachers," because they are not allowed to continue more than three years in the same circuit, and under these are the "local" or lay preachers, who reside permanently in the circuit to which they are attached. The senior minister exercises a general supervision over all the affairs of the circuit, and is called a "superintendent." 4. *Districts*, including some eighteen "circuits," and organized for the purpose of having the preachers meet at stated times to confer upon matters of finance and discipline, and to transact the ordinary business of Conference when that body is not in session. 5. *Conference*, consisting of the "traveling preachers," and being the supreme governing body of the Methodist community. It meets once a year and fills its own vacancies. Its sessions may not be protracted beyond three weeks, nor last less than five days.

The Methodists aim at reviving spiritual life among the masses through the ministry of their itinerant preachers, and at founding benevolent associations on a large scale. All the divisions of Methodism in Europe, America, and Australia numbered, in 1874, 3,626,830 full members and several hundred thousand probationists.[2]

---

[1] See *Fletcher's* Checks to Antinomism, Vol. II., pp. 22, 200, 215. Works, Vol. III., p. 50; Vol. IV., p. 97. Compare Dr. *Milner's* End of Rel. Controv., Letter VI.

[2] *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, Heresies, etc., art. "Methodists." Amer. Cyclop., art. "Methodism." (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

§ 382. *The Swedenborgians or Church of the New Jerusalem.*

Swedenborg, Arcana coelestia in verbo domini detecta una cum mirabilib. quae visa sunt in mundo spirituum, 1749 sq., 8 T., 4to, ed. *Tafel*, Tueb. 1833 sq., 5 vols.; Vera chr. rel., Amst. 1771, "True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church, by Emmanuel Swedenborg, Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ," transl. from the orig. Lat. work, 5th ed., Lond. 1819. A series of writings by and respecting Swedenborg, communicated by *Immanuel Tafel* and *Louis Hofacker;* especially, Divine Revelations, from the Latin, Tueb. 1823 sq., 8 vols.; The Doctrine of Christ in its Purity, Tueb. 1831 sq., 4 vols.; Catechism and Doctrine of the New Church, Tueb. 1830. (After the Catechism of the General Conference, London, 1828.) *Tafel*, A Comparative Exposition and Review of the Doctrinal System of Cath. and Prot.; also, Exposition of the Differential Doctrines of Swedenborg, Tueb. 1835. *Tafel*, Swedenborg and his Adversaries, Tueb. 1841, 2 vols. *Moehler*, Symbolism, Pt. II., chap. IV. *Jos. Goerres*, Em. Swedenborg and his Relation to the Church, Spire, 1828. *C. F. Nanz*, Em. Swed., the Northern Seer, Hall in Suabia, 2d ed., 1850. Many works of Swed. have been translated by different persons, and published by *O. Clapp*, of Boston, 1848–1851. *J. G. Wilkinson*, Biogr. of Em. Sw., Boston, 1849. *A. Clissold*, Practical Nature of the Doctrines of E. S., Boston, 1839. *K. Hagenbach*, Ch. H. in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries; tr. by Hurst, Lecture XXI., pp. 473 sq. *Dorner*, l. c., p. 662–667.

Emmanuel Swedenborg (1688–1772) was the son of Jesper Swedberg, the Lutheran titular Bishop of Skara, in West Gothland. He was highly educated, held the office of Assessor of the Royal Metallic College at Stockholm, traveled much through Europe for scientific purposes, and when about fifty-five years of age began to fancy himself the recipient of supernatural revelations. He professed to have been lifted up to Heaven, and there to have received a commission to restore true Christianity and to inaugurate a new and endless era for the Church. This era was to open precisely on the 19th of June, 1770. This was to be the New Heaven and the New Earth, the *Celestial Jerusalem* foretold in the Apocalypse. Notwithstanding the theosophic and speculative character of the doctrine of Swedenborg, it had also an eminently practical bearing.

After attacking the doctrine of justification, as held by Protestants, with a view of showing that it is dangerously subversive of morality, he went on to draw out a strangely *grotesque system* of his own, substituting for the mystery of the

Hosted by Google

Trinity and the dogma of redemption through Christ's death a triple manifestation of the Godhead, first in the person of our Lord, and again in Swedenborg himself. This he did because a belief in the Trinity and Christ's vicarious death was the groundwork of the Protestant view of justification by faith alone, which he regarded as detrimental to purity of morals. As a consequence, he was obliged to reject the doctrines of original sin and man's fall. All these teachings, he said, were errors introduced into Christianity by the Council of Nice, previously to which his was the prevailing idea of the Trinity. Angels and demons, according to him, are only other names for the souls of the just and the reprobate; and the doctrines of satisfaction through Christ, predestination, and the resurrection of the flesh are only idle inventions. Having elaborated his system, he set about arranging the canon of the Sacred Books so as to fit into it, and neither retained nor quoted, as revealed and authentic, any portion of either the Old Testament or the New, except the Four Gospels and the Apocalypse, on which he put his own novel and arbitrary interpretation.[1]

The followers of Swedenborg, who were chiefly of the better classes, were quite numerous in Sweden, England, North America, France, and Würtemberg. In the last-named country, his fantastic writings, published by *Tafel*, were extensively circulated. In an age characterized by every sort of intellectual and religious lawlessness; when society was rent asunder by schism and made dreary by unbelief; when the first stirrings of reviving faith were beginning to be felt and the religious sense to be purified by the very excesses of Protestantism; and when the intellect was not yet sufficiently emancipated from its old habits to seize what was simple and logical and appreciate what was pure, and on this very account liable to be fascinated and led captive by what was new and strange, the incoherent reveries of Swedenborg found acceptance, because they answered a state of mind not fully prepared for the majesty of truth yet repelled by the deformity of error.

[1] *Tafel*, The Divinity of Holy Writ, or the Deeper Sense of Scripture, Tuebingen, 1838.

Hosted by Google

§ 383. *Protestant Missions.*

Steger, Protestant Missions and their Happy Results, in three parts, 2d ed., Hof. 1844. *Wiggers*, Hist. of Evangelical Missions, Hamburg, 1845. *Herzog's* Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., p. 559 sq. *Grundemann's* Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867–1871.

At no time in the history of Protestantism have its ministers displayed the same heroic spirit of self-sacrifice which has in every age been characteristic of the priests of the Catholic Church; and in no instance have the missions undertaken by the former, notwithstanding the immense wealth at their command, and the other conditions of success by which they were surrounded, ever attained anything approaching the measure of success reached by those of the latter. Why, it may be asked, did not the Protestants, in the fervor of their first enthusiasm, imitate the example of the Jesuits, whose origin was almost contemporaneous with theirs, and carry the light of faith and the consolations of grace to those sitting in darkness in far distant lands? It may be urged that their ardent and expansive charity had a work sufficient for its resources in reclaiming the Catholic idolators at home. Doubtless it had. But it is certainly not very complimentary to the astuteness popularly ascribed to the Jesuit that he did not allege a similar pretext, and thus escape the difficulties and perils of a foreign mission. Of all the Protestant sects, the *United Brethren* were the most distinguished for missionary zeal (since 1732); but so grotesque and fantastic was the Gospel which they preached that, while it found favor with a comparatively small number of persons already familiar with and prepared to accept its peculiarities, it was utterly powerless to effect the conversion of the rude and untutored savage. Desirous of retaining peaceable possession of her *North American colonies*, England made an effort to convert their aboriginal tribes to Christianity, and for this purpose sent out *John Eliot*,[1] who commenced his labors among them in 1646.

In 1647 the Puritans, who were then in possession of the

[1] *Eliot*, Chr. Commonwealth, or the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ, 1652 sq., 2 T., 4to. *Mather*, Eccl. Hist. of New England, London, 1702, f.

Hosted by Google

supreme authority, established a society for carrying the light of the Gospel into foreign lands; while the pious *Herrnhutters*[1] and the ardent *Methodists*, acting on the impulse of faith and devotion, and without either official recognition or aid from government, crossed the seas to aid in winning the savages to Christianity.

Following the example of England, the Danish government established, and, with the active assistance of the Orphan House at Halle, has maintained since 1706 a mission at *Tranquebar* for its East India possessions, from which the first Protestant missionaries were obtained by England for her East India and West India colonies. In the East their success was inconsiderable, and in the West the conversions were wholly confined to the slave class.[2]

Denmark and Sweden sent missionaries to the frozen regions of *Lapland* and *Greenland*,[3] where the seeds of Christianity, sown at an earlier date by Catholic evangelists, had almost perished from the soil. Since the fifteenth century the name of Greenland had almost dropped out of the list of European countries, to whose fellowship it was now destined to be restored by *Hans Egede*,[4] a pious and zealous Norwegian minister, who, aided by the Danish government and by a society of merchants (1721), made his way to the frozen shores of its western coast, where he found a few thousand Esquimaux, to whose conversion and improvement he devoted his energies, and among whom the blessings of Christianity and

[1] An Abstract of the History of the Missions of the Evangelical Brethren, Gnadau, 1832. Cf. *Walch*, New Religious History, Vol. VIII., p. 251 sq.

[2] Missionary Reports, publ. at Halle, since 1708. *Walch*, l. cit., Vol. V., p. 119. Memoirs of *Chr. F. Swartz*, and Hist. of Rel. in India, London, 1826.

[3] Acta hist. eccl., T. XI., p. 1 sq.; T. XV., p. 230 sq. *J. Shefferus*, Hist. of Lapland, with Sketches, etc. Oxford, 1674, f. *Leem*, Laplanders in Finmark; tr. from the Danish into Germ., Lps. 1771. *Rudelbach*, in Knapp's Christoterpe, 1833. (Tr.)

[4] *H. Egede*, Account of the Greenland Mission, Hamburg, 1740. (*Hans Egede*, A Description of Greenland and Life of the Author, London, 1818.) *Paul Egede*, Accounts of Greenland, summarized from a Diary, from 1721–1740, Copenhagen, 1790. *Rudelbach*, Hans Egede, Bp. of Greenland (Chr. Biogr. 1850, Vol. I.); Iceland, Greenland, and the Faroe Isles, New York, 1830. *Kölbing*, Hist. of the Mission of Greenland, Gnadau, 1731. Missionary Records respecting Greenland, Labrador, etc. (Pres. Board), Philadelphia, 1830.

Hosted by Google

civilization have been perpetuated by the establishment of Danish colonies. The *Moravian Brethren* have (fr. 1733) established several missionary stations in Greenland.[1] Mention should also be made here of the *Institution* founded at Halle in 1728 by Professor *Callenberg* for the conversion of Jews and Mohammedans, but the results in no way answered the expectations of its founder.

§ 384. *Relations of Catholics to Protestants.*

The relations subsisting between Catholics and Protestants in the different countries of Europe were of course as various as the circumstances that called them forth; but, strange to say, notwithstanding the desolating horrors of the Thirty Years' War, they were more pacific in Germany than elsewhere. It is not meant, however, that the bitterness of polemical strife had entirely ceased to manifest itself in the attitude of parties toward each other, but only that matters were mending. So deep-seated and persistent was the hostility of Protestants toward the Catholic Church and everything that came from her, that even so late as the middle of the eighteenth century they declined to accept the corrected Gregorian Calendar; and when, in 1744, *Prince Hohenlohe* showed a disposition to force his Lutheran ministers to celebrate the feast of Easter on the same day with the Catholics, the *Corpus Evangelicorum*, smarting under other real or imaginary grievances, declared they would have recourse to arms rather than do so, and in 1750 made good their word. Moreover, so intolerant and fiercely violent was the expression of feeling against Catholics on the occasion of the celebration of the *Second Centenary Jubilee of the Reformation*, and so extravagantly fulsome the chorus of praises extolling the merits

[1] The *Danish* Lutherans have (from North to South) organized the following *twelve* missionary districts, viz: Upernavik, Omenak, Ritenbenk, Jacobshavn, Christianshaab, Egedesminde, Holsteinborg, Sukkertoppen, Godthaab, Fiskernaes, Frederikshaab, Julianeshaab. The *Moravian Brethren* have erected the missionary districts of New Herrnhut (1733), Lichtenfels (1758), Lichtenau (1774), Friedrichsthal (1824), Umanak, and Igdlorpait, in Greenland; and (fr. 1771) those of Nain, Ohkak, Hopedale, Hebron, and Zoar, on the coast of Labrador. *Grundemann*, l. c., p. 62 sq. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

and virtues of Luther,[1] that the celebrated controversialist, *Weislinger*, indignant at the insults put upon his faith, and smarting under the wounds inflicted by the poisoned shafts of his adversaries, adopted a similar method of warfare, and with such effect that he was pursued through every court, ecclesiastical and civil, to which he was amenable, by his Protestant aggressors.[2] Again, when in 1731 *Count Leopold Anthony von Firmian*, Archbishop *of Salzburg*, having ordered such of his Protestant subjects as were resisting his authority and inciting his Catholic subjects to rebellion and apostasy to quit his dominions, about twenty thousand of them departed without molestation, some to take up their abodes in the depopulated districts of Lithuania, and others to go either to England or America,[3] both his moral and religious character were assailed with brutal violence, and his decree of emigration characterized as an act of barbarous intolerance, such as had never before disgraced a civilized ruler. But though the character and the acts of the archbishop do not merit the severity of the censure they have received, it can not and need not be denied that the conduct of his officials in carrying out

[1] *Weislinger*, in the Preface to his work entitled *Friss Vogel oder Stirb*, says: "If all that they (the Lutherans) incessantly reproach us with in their writings, sermons, conversations, and jubilee-medals were true, then there never existed on this earth, or could exist, a religion more diabolical than the Catholic faith and worship, or a people more godless and more deserving the execration of mankind than the Catholics themselves."

[2] See p. 541, note 3.

[3] *De Caspari*, Authentic Hist. of the Emigration from Salzburg, transl. fr. the Latin into Germ. by *Huber*, Salzburg, 1790. *Zauner* and *Gaertner*, Chronicle of Salzburg, Vol. X., Salzb. 1821, pp. 20–399. History of the Emigrants or Lutherans banished from the Archbishopric of Salzburg, 3d ed., Lps. 1733, 4to. This work is written in partisan spirit, and is flagrantly untruthful. †**Clarus*, Emigration of the Protestant Proselytizing Salzburgians in the years 1731 and 1732, Innsbruck, 1864. Cf. *Hist.* and *Political Papers*, Vol. 54, year 1864, pp. 813–842. *Gfroerer*, in the first volume of the Hist. of the Eighteenth Century, draws attention to the partisan spirit of the History of the Emigrants, etc., noted above. "In my opinion," he says, "the Salzburg Emigration is the darkest page in the history of Frederic William I. And yet, if we read the works published in Northern Germany, we shall be told that Archbishop Firmian is a monster of iniquity, while Frederic William I. of Prussia is extolled as a paragon of purity, an upright prince, and a model man. To what a depth of degradation is our national historical literature fallen!"

Hosted by Google

his instructions is not defensible, and fully deserves the stern rebuke administered in the review of these transactions by *Clarus*.

The members of the Reformed Church within the *Palatinate of the Rhine* also made frequent complaints of acts of oppression, which they claimed they had suffered at the hands of the Catholic House of *Neuburg* of the Palatinate.[1] But whether their hardships were real or imaginary, they were mild in comparison of those suffered either by the *Hugenots* after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes[2] or by the Dissidents of Poland, in consequence of the interference of foreign powers in the internal affairs of that country.[3] While the Catholics of the British Empire were under the restriction of laws of the most despotic severity, *Joseph II.* of Austria issued an *Edict of Toleration* (1781), granting freedom of worship to all Protestants, *Deists* alone excepted. After the conquest of Silesia by *Frederic II.*, both Catholics and Protestants were placed on a footing of perfect equality (1742), though the former were decidedly in the worse condition, by reason of the confiscation of the estates belonging to their convents.

As mixed *marriages between Catholics and Protestants* were becoming daily more frequent, in consequence of the increasing intercourse between the members of both denominations, they gave rise to serious difficulties as years went on. Protestants, now in the enjoyment of the fullest political franchise, laid claims also to privileges which the Catholic Church reserves for her own children; and when marrying Catholics demanded the blessing of the priest, while professing to believe that marriage was not a Sacrament. Although the question was *then* an open one among theologians, the doctrine held at Rome was *that the contracting parties are the real ministers of the Sacrament of marriage*, and not the priest who gives the marriage blessing,[4] still *Benedict XIV.*, following the

[1] *Planck*, New Hist. of Religion, Pt. II., pp. 125–226, with Proofs and Illustrations.

[2] See p. 281.

[3] *Huth*, Vol. II., p. 233–241. *Walch*, Pt. VII., p. 7–160.

[4] The Interpretes Conc. Trid. declared on the 31st of July, 1752: "Accedit, parochum in matrimoniis nullam exercere jurisdictionem, cum ex *veriori* et *re-*

Hosted by Google

impresciptable principles of the Church, when questioned upon the subject by bishops, and notably by those of Holland and Poland, returned the uniform answer contained in the bull *Magnae nobis admirationis* (issued June 29, 1748), namely, that mixed marriages could be *tolerated* only on certain conditions, the most important of which is that the children born of them be brought up in the Catholic Church; but that they should never receive such color of approval as a formal ecclesiastical function would imply.[1] Far, however, from wishing these conditions to serve as a sort of clandestine apparatus for proselytism, popes, bishops, and zealous ecclesiastics have at all times dissuaded against such marriages as detrimental alike to the happiness of the family and the interests of religion.[2]

ceptiori sententia ipse non sit minister magni hujus sacramenti matrimonii, qui cum aliis testibus certam reddat ecclesiam, hunc atque illam matrimonium contraxisse, ut ex hac quoque ratione abesse videatur quaestio de jurisdictione a delegato non subdelegando." (Thesaurus resolution. sacr. Congr. Conc. Trid., T. XX., Rom. 1752, pp. 91, 92.)

[1] *Luther* and *Calvin* held a very different opinion on this subject, declaring that marriages between Catholics and Protestants were utterly inadmissible and impious, and appealing for authority to the words of St. Paul, "Bear not the yoke with unbelievers." (II. Cor., vi. 14.) Enactments were passed by the synods of *Lyons* (1568) and *Saumur* (1596), embodying the same sentiment; while that of *Montpellier* (1598) pronounced sentence of deposition and deprivation against all ministers who should bless mixed marriages. The ground of such severity is thus stated by *Gentilis*, and is characteristically Calvinistic. "Catholics," he says, "may well permit such marriages, because, from their point of view, Protestants are only *heretics;* but Protestants must emphatically reject them, because in their eyes Catholics are not only heretics, but *antichrists!*" This opinion was modified some time later by *Carpzov*, who allowed "that mixed marriages might be permitted, but only on condition that there be a reasonably certain hope of both the Catholic party and all the offspring being eventually Lutheran."

[2] †*Binterim*, Memorabilia, Vol. VII., Pt. I., p. 137 sq.; Pt. II., p. 1-179. †*Kutschker*, Mixed Marriages, Viewed from the Catholic Standpoint, 3d ed., Vienna, 1841. †**Kuntsmann*, Hist. of Mixed Marriages among the divers Christian Denominations, Ratisbon, 1839. †*Roskovany*, Historia matrimoniorum mixtorum. Quinque Ecclesiis, 1842, 2 T. †*Reinerding*, The Principle of Canon Law in the Question of Mixed Marriages, Paderborn, 1854.

Hosted by Google

§ 385. *The Russian Church under the Permanent Synod.* (Cf. § 359.)

Ptchler, Hist. of the Schism between the East and the West, Vol. II., p. 144 sq., with reference to the new works of *Theiner*, *Gagarin*, *Haxthausen*, and others. *Philaret*, Hist. of the Russian Church, Frkft. 1872, 2 vols.

It has been already stated[1] that even from a political point of view the growing power of the Patriarch of Moscow had roused the jealousy of *Peter the Great*, who was apprehensive that possibly this ecclesiastical dignitary might some day resist the arbitrary demands of a despotic Tzar. He formed the design, therefore, of abolishing the patriarchate, and substituting in its stead an ecclesiastical organization, from whose opposition the government would have nothing to fear in carrying out its projects. The undertaking was surrounded with no ordinary dangers, as the people were much attached to the patriarchal constitution, and hence it was necessary for the Tzar to proceed with great prudence and caution.

On the death of the *eleventh* Patriarch, in 1702, Peter employed all manner of pretexts to put off the appointment of his successor, and, as a temporary provision, placed the administration of the patriarchate in the hands of the metropolitan of Riazan, who, being but a mere exarch, neither commanded the respect nor possessed the fulness of authority belonging to the lawful incumbent of the patriarchal office. During this interval the interference of the Tzar in ecclesiastical affairs was in the highest degree arbitrary. He levied taxes upon the estates of convents and bishops; abolished the titles and dignities attached to bishoprics, whose incumbents had given him offense; and, when these sees fell vacant, directed the exarch to fill them with simple bishops, whose pastoral prerogatives he attenuated to the verge of extinction. He soon began to introduce radical reforms in the convents of men and women, as is shown by the series of ordinances on this subject drawn up in 1702 and succeeding years. The Tzar next gave his attention to the secular clergy, and was good enough to write out with his own hand a pastoral instruction, in twenty-six articles, called a *spiritual regulation*,

[1] See p. 470.

Hosted by Google

prescribing the qualifications of candidates going up for orders and of bishops for consecration, and treating other cognate subjects, and this, in his character of Supreme Bishop, he addressed to the bishops of his obedience for their guidance and edification.

The Russian Church was then organized as follows:

Every cathedral or episcopal church was to have one protopope, or, as we should say, dean, two treasurers, five popes (i. e. fathers), one protodeacon, four deacons, two readers, two sacristans, and thirty-two choristers to sing the service. In the principal parish-churches there were to be one protopope, two popes, two deacons, two chanters, and two sacristans; in other more considerable parish-churches, two popes, two deacons, two chanters, and two sacristans; and in parishes of two or three hundred families, three priests, three deacons, and three sacristans were charged with the care of public worship. If there were too many clergy at one church, part of them were sent where their services were more needed.

By these measures the Tzar accustomed both clergy and people to yield a passive obedience to the behests of his powerful will, and thus advancing step by step ended by abolishing the office of Patriarch. In a solemn assembly of bishops he finally declared that, in his opinion, the Patriarchate was no longer necessary, either for the government of the Church or the well-being of the State; that, since the extent of the Empire rendered supreme spiritual authority perilous when committed to a single individual, and inefficient when vested in a general council, he had determined to introduce a form of ecclesiastical government that would combine the elements of both, without the dangers or inconveniences of either; and that this should consist in a small, *select*, and *permanent* synod, with full authority to regulate all ecclesiastical affairs.

When some of the bishops, by way of remonstrance, ventured to state that the patriarchate of Kiev and that of all the Russias had been established only by the authority of the Patriarch of the East, the Tzar, assuming an *authoritive* air, and striking his breast, replied, "*Behold here your Patriarch!*" As the event proved, the Tzar knew his men, for it was not long until there were to be found among them ecclesiastics and bishops cowardly and base enough to take upon them to justify the imperial measure, and to sacrifice to a wicked

Hosted by Google

ambition the independence and freedom of the Church they professed to serve. At the head of this troop of ecclesiastical poltroons was *Theophanes Procopovicz*, since 1718 Bishop of Pskov and Narva. After these preparatory measures, Peter submitted at the last Council of Moscow, in 1720, his "*Ecclesiastical Regulation*," as corrected by his own hand, for the approbation and signature of the bishops, archimandrites, and hegumenes of the principal monasteries. This council also enacted that the "Holy Synod" should be *permanent*, and enjoy supreme ecclesiastical authority, and that its decisions should be final in all matters appertaining to the Church. The "*Regulation*" also set forth the motives which impelled the Tzar to establish a *Holy Synod*, whose functions should be legislative and whose sittings permanent. Some of these are of remarkable astuteness and subtlety.[1] Not long after this *coup de grâce* the *Holy Synod* was solemnly opened (February 25, 1721) by a discourse from its vice-president, Archbishop Theophanes. It was composed of eleven members, namely, a president, two vice-presidents, four councillors, and four assessors; but this number was increased to fourteen in 1722. The knowledge and capacity of the *first* members of this Synod, in whose selection the Tzar had exhibited an unusual degree of political prudence, gave to that body a consideration throughout the Empire which it would not otherwise have

[1] 1. A synod is more capable than a single individual to form a judgment and to give decisions; 2. The decisions of such a body are of greater weight and more commanding authority than those of any one man; 3. As the synod convenes by the order and under the *supervision* of the *Tzar*, there need be no suspicion of either partiality or unfairness, as the Tzar will always put the public good before any private interest (?); 4. The transaction of business will not be interrupted either by disease or death; 5. In a synod like this, whose members are taken from the different orders, there is little ground to apprehend the influence either of passion or of corruption; 6. A number of persons participating in a single act will not be as easily deterred as an individual acting alone would be, from doing their duty, because in dread of the vengeance of the powerful; 7. Revolts and insurrections are for this reason prevented; 8. If the president of a synod makes mistakes or acts unwisely, he may be corrected by his brethren, but a patriarch would not submit his acts to the bishops subordinate to him; 9. A synodal government of this sort would become, in course of time, a nursery of able and distinguished ecclesiastics, and the assessors would in consequence acquire a knowledge of ecclesiastical administration.

Hosted by Google

been able to command. They were chosen from the most distinguished of the bishops, from the archimandrites, from the hegumenes of the principal convents, and from the protopopes. The Synod once established, as a necessary consequence the bonds uniting the Russian Church to that of the East were severed. Its every act was molded to fit the policy of the Tzar, whose will was the supreme rule of action. Hence, on being likened to King Louis XIV., Peter might justly rejoin: "I think I have beaten the French King on one capital point; I have brought my clergy to obedience and peace. Louis has allowed himself to be subjugated by his" (?!)[1] The successors of Peter I. were hardly less pleased than himself with this creation of his genius, and appreciating its importance as an engine of state policy, were very careful to preserve it. Its influences were potent, sorrowful, and inevitable. From this time forth the Russian Church was in a condition of abject servitude; it became the mother of numerous sects, and ceased completely to exert any moral influence over its members.[2] The most numerous sect that has sprung from it is that of the *Raskolniks*, or Separatists, but who style themselves *Starowierzi*, or Men of the Old Faith. There are many subdivisions of this sect, based upon trifling differences.[3]

[1] Such conduct, certainly, does not show any inclination on his part toward a union with the Catholic Church, as *Theiner* attempted to prove in his work, entitled "The Latest Phase of the Catholic Church in Poland and Russia."

[2] I have seen in Russia a Church which no one attacks, and which, to all appearances, every one respects; a Church which, in the exercise of its moral authority, has every condition of success; and, nevertheless, this Church has absolutely no hold on the hearts of men; it produces hypocrites and persons given to superstition, but none others. (La Russie en 1839 par le Marquis *de Custine*, Bruxelles, 1844, T. IV., p. 434.)

[3] Cf., on these sects, *Aug. de Haxthausen*, Studies on the Internal Condition of Russia and on the Russian People, Hanover, 1847, II. Pts. See "*The Catholic*," 1848, nro. 42.

Hosted by Google

PART SECOND.

FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DOWN TO OUR OWN DAY (1789–1878).

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CONFLICT WITH FALSE POLITICAL THEORIES—THE NEGATIVE CHARACTER OF PROTESTANTISM GROWS DAILY MORE PRONOUNCED.

§ 386. *General Literature—Importance of Modern Church History.*

I. * Bullarii Romani continuatio summor. Pontificum *Clementis XIII.—Gregor. XVI.*, Rom. 1835 sq. Collectio Lacensis, acta et decreta Conc. recent., T. II. sq. For other documents and public papers, see *Müller's* Cyclopaedia of Canon Law, and *Vater's* Structure of Modern Ch. H. See, above, p. 475. *Huth,* † Essay on the Ch. H. of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II., Augsburg, 1809. † Late Hist. of the Church of Christ, from the Accession of Pius VII. (1800) till the Times of Gregory XVI. (1833), transl. fr. the Italian into German, 2d ed., Augsburg, 1836. †*Robiano,* Continuation de l'Hist. ecclésiastique de Berault-Bercastel (1721–1830), Paris, 1836, 4 T. †*Gams,* Hist. of the Church in the Nineteenth Century, with Special Reference to Germany, being a continuation of *Bérault-Bercastel's* Ch. H., Innsbruck, 1853 sq., 3 vols. †*Rohrbacher,* Histoire univ. de l'église, T. 27 and 28. *Scharpf,* Lectures on Modern Ch. H., Freiburg, 1852. *Saint-George,* Le Christianisme au XIXe siècle, Paris, 1853. *Gieseler,* Ch. H., Vol. V. (fr. 1814 till a very recent date). *Hagenbach,* Hist. of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, Pt. II., 4th ed., Leipsig, 1872; Engl. tr. by *Hurst,* Vol. II., New York, 1869. (Tr.) *Baur,* Ch. H. in the Nineteenth Century (Vol. V.) *Nippold,* Manual of Modern Ch. H., from 1814, Elberfeld, 1867.

For Political History: *Cesare Cantù,* Univ. Hist., Germ., by *Brühl,* Vol. XIII. †*Boost,* Modern Hist. of Mankind, from the Commencement of the French Revolution down to Our Own Days, Vol. I. (Hist. of France), 2d ed., Ratisbon, 1843; Vol. II., Augsburg, 1843 (Hist. of Austria). *Leo,* Abridgment of Univ. Hist., Vols. IV. and V. *A. Alison,* History of Europe, from the Commencement of the French Revolution to the Restoration of the Bourbons, Edinburgh, 1833–1842; 10th ed., 14 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1861; German, by *Mayer,* 6 vols., Lps. 1842–1846; also transl. into Hindoostance and Arabic; so is likewise the continuation of this work: "History of Europe, from the Fall of Napoleon to the Accession of Louis Napoleon," 6 vols., Edinb. 1852–1857; 7th vol., London, 1865. (Tr.) *Wolfgang Menzel,* Hist. of Europe, fr. the Commencement of the Fr. Revol., 1789–1815, 3d ed., Stuttg. 1866, 2 vols.; by the *same,* Hist. of the Last Forty Years, 1816–1856, and Hist. of the

Hosted by Google

Last One Hundred and Twenty Years, 1740–1860. *Louis Blanc*, Hist. de dix ans 1830–1840, Paris, 4 vols. (We recommend only the documentary proofs, not the spirit of the work.) Among the *Political Periodicals*, we offer for consultation, above all, The *Moniteur*, *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the Chronicle of the Nineteenth Century, from 1801.

With the latter half of the present epoch the subject-matter of Church History approaches gradually nearer our own times, until finally it passes into the age in which we live, and with whose development and culture our life is, for better or worse, intimately connected. If the very nearness of the subject attracts us, its interest will grow upon us still more as we reflect that modern times are richer in events of extraordinary import and far-reaching consequences, whether in the civil or ecclesiastical domain, than any age in the past history of mankind, with perhaps not more than one or two exceptions, and therefore supply abundant and varied matter to the historian. A thorough and complete acquaintance with the religious condition, *internal* and *external*, of the Church during the passing and past years included in this interval is all the more necessary to the theologian, in that, as a pastor of souls, he is in daily contact with the practical affairs of life, and should at once help to revive and exert an influence upon religious principles and moral conduct; and this he can not do if he possess not the information requisite to give meaning and purpose to his endeavors. If thoroughness of treatment be demanded in any portion of Church History, it is assuredly in that embracing the events of most recent times. Nor should the current objection "*that these times are not yet sufficiently full for such treatment, or that in treating of them some events must be either passed over entirely or drawn with a most skillful and delicate touch*," be allowed to have more than its just weight. The difficulty may be obviated if the historian beware of setting forth imperfectly developed events as complete and accomplished facts; and if, in touching upon affairs personal to those still living, he do so only in so far as they are matter of historical fact. This was the method pursued by *Eusebius*, the Father of Church History, who sets forth the events of his own age with remarkable fullness. (Pref. to Bk. VIII.)

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH FROM 1789–1878.

The French Revolution.

†*Barruel*, Collection ecclésiastique, ou recueil complet des ouvrages faits depuis l'ouverture des états généraux, relativement au clergé, 7 T.; Germ., Kempten, 1795–1797, 10 pts. By the *same*, Histoire du clergé de France pendant la révolution, Lond. 1794 and 1804; Germ, by *Collinet*, Frkft. and Lps. (Münster), 1794, 2 vols. Histoire du clérgé en France pendant la révolution d'après Barruel, Montjoie, Picot, etc., par M. R. * * * Paris, 3 T. †*Carron*, Les confesseurs de la foi dans l'église gallicane à la fin du 18 siècle, Paris, 1820, 4 T.; Germ., by *Räss* and *Weis*, Mentz, 1822–1826, 4 vols. *Barruel*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme (1797 and 1803), Lyons, 1818 sq., 4 T. †*Jager*, Histoire de l'église de France pendant la révolution, Paris, 1852 sq., 3 T. *Boost*, Latest Hist. of France (1789–1835). *Wachsmuth*, Hist. of France during the Revolution, Hamburg, 1840 sq., 4 vols. †*Mazas*, Hist. of the French Revolution; Germ., by *Scherer*; with preface and additions by *Hoefler*, Ratisbon, 1842, 2 little volumes. *Polignac*, Jules, Prince de, Historical, Political, and Moral Studies; Germ., Ratisbon, 1846, 2 vols. †*Gaume*, The Revolution, being Hist. Researches on the Origin and Propagation of Bad Principles in Europe, from the Renaissance down to Our Own Times; Germ., Ratisbon, 1856 sq., 5 vols. *Burke*, Reflections on the Revolution of France, published in 1790; tr. into Fr. by *Dupont;* into Germ. by *Frederic v. Gentz*, Brunswick, 1838, 2 pts. (This work of Burke's, written in condemnation of the principles of 1789, led to an open rupture with Fox, his former political friend.—Tr.) *Alexis de Tocqueville*, L'ancien régime et la révolution, Paris, 1856. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 43, in two articles. *Dahlmann*, Hist. of the French Revolution (to the republic), Lps. (1845) 1847. *Fr. v. Raumer*, Hist. of France and the French Revolution, 1740–1795, Lps. 1850; *v. *Sybel*, Hist. of the Age of Revolution, from 1789–1795, Düsseldorf (1858), 1872, 4 vols. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., p. 251–289; Fr. tr., Vol. 20, p. 232–272.

A.—The Last Years of Pius VI., 1789–1800.

(*Hulot*), Collectio Brevium et Instr. Pii VI. ad praesentes Gallic. Ecclesiae calamitates, Aug. 1796, 2 T.; Lips. 1871, 2 T. Continuatio Bullarii, T. V.–X. *Baldassari*, Hist. of the Abduction and Imprisonment of Pius VI.; Germ., by *Steck*, Tueb. 1844; *Bissing*, France under Louis XVI., Freiburg, 1872.

Hosted by Google

§ 387. *The French National Assembly* (*La Consituante*), 1789–1791.

The consequences of the principles upon which the Reformation was based did not fully open upon the minds of men until they began to pass the line dividing the domain of religion from that of politics. The political event in which these principles were most thoroughly embodied, and in which, beyond doubt, they obtained their most complete illustration, was the French Revolution.[1] The early Reformers, Luther, Ulric von Hutten, Francis von Sickingen, and Thomas Münzer, inaugurated their religious reform by overturning the existing political order, and thence proceeded in their work of destruction to suppress monasteries by violence, to confiscate the property of the Church, and to secularize religious institutions in the name of princes. They subverted the authority of the *Church*, and, as a necessary consequence, the authority of the State fell with it. To a divine and unchangeable religion and to an infallible rule of faith and morals, succeeded, by an inevitable law, religious doubt, whence sprang the Deism of England, and, as time went on, a widespread moral corruption. The ideas of unrestrained liberty and absolute equality advocated by the French Jacobins were not new; they had been proclaimed with sufficient distinctness and in every variety of form by Münzer's rebellious peasants; while the members of the French Clubs found in the words and conduct of Luther an eloquent apology and

[1] This view is steadily growing in favor, even with Protestants, and is openly set forth as the correct one by such distinguished writers as *Wolfgang Menzel*, *Henry Leo* (Vol. IV., p. 153), and others. There are many passages in the writings of *Mazas* which prove that he is also of this opinion. (Cf. Vol. I., pp. 115–201, and *Hoefler's* Preface.) *Louis Blanc* (Introd. to the Hist. of the French Revolution) and *Polignac* (l. c., Vol. I., p. 75) bear still more emphatic testimony to the same fact. The latter says: "At the breaking out of the French Revolution, wickedness, having worked its way up the scale of iniquity, had reached its climax; the prevailing heresy of Luther and Henry VIII. had commenced to make its influence felt; then succeeded religious indifference, unbelief, and finally revolt against God Himself, His commandments, and His laws." Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., and *Fehr*, Development and Influence of Political Theories, Innsbruck, 1855.

Hosted by Google

model for their own contemptuous hatred of royalty. Moreover, the wit, the brilliancy, the multifarious scepticism, the fashionable unbelief, and easy morals of the splendid age of Louis XIV., had produced a luxuriant crop of authors, who perpetuated their errors in writings remarkable for attractive grace and classic elegance of style. Finally, Deists and materialistic philosophers, clumsy imitators of their English prototypes, encouraged by the debauchery of a depraved Court, and relying upon the protection of irreligious ministers, proceeded fearlessly to carry out their designs by outraging religion and undermining the principles of faith and morals. Of such were *Peter Bayle*, *Voltaire*, *d'Alembert*, *Diderot*, and *Jean Jacques Rousseau*, all working, each in his own way, for the utter annihilation of religion. It was Diderot that said, in a spirit of diabolical malignity, that if he were in need of a rope to hang the last king, he would make it of the entrails of the last priest.[1] Finally, as if to make a mockery of religion, a memoir was published of the frivolous Cardinal-Archbishop *Dubois*, formerly Prime Minister of France, († 1723), revealing a shocking depth of moral depravity, such as might be expected in the life of one who held morality to be a prejudice of the multitude, and religion the invention of priests, and who in his dying moments repelled the grace of the Sacraments.[2] The wicked designs of the philosophers and encyclopaedists were still further advanced by the powerful influence of the mistresses, whom Louis XV. continued to keep in defiance of all decency, and by the universal tone of irreligion prevalent at Court. The clergy spoke out, *giving warning of the menacing dangers ahead;* but their words fell upon ears that would not hear.[3] To writings in which religion was outraged, soon succeeded others in which *royalty* was contemptuously reviled.[4] With the thunder of such ominous forebodings as those

[1] Et avec les boyaux du dernier prêtre
Égorger le dernier des rois.

[2] *De la Houssaye-Pegeault*, Vie privée du Cardinal Dubois, 1789, 8vo.

[3] The Assembly of the Clergy, in a memorial to the king, dated July 20, 1789, gave utterance to these prophetic words: Encore quelques années de silence et l'ébranlement, devenu général, ne laissera plus apercevoir que des débris et des ruines. Apud *Robiano*, T. II., p. 53.

[4] To this class belongs the Philosophical History of the Commerce of the

Hosted by Google

already ringing in his ears, Louis XV. departed this life (May 10, 1774), with the presentiment strong upon him that the crown would some day be struck from the head of his grandson. Some years later, when disorder became general and ruin imminent, the dastardly *Maurepas* cried out: "Would that things might remain as they are until we are gone."

Hardly a dozen years had gone by since the *expulsion of the Jesuits*, and impiety had already doubled, both in extent and intensity. A new generation of scholars, educated under new masters, and having hardly any religious knowledge, and certainly destitute of all religious habit and devotional feeling, had gone forth from the colleges to become active members of society. Revealed truth had been crushed out of men's minds to give room to a rationalistic philosophy and to unfounded prejudices; and the impiety, which had been heretofore confined to the inhabitants of the cities, began to find its way into the provinces and to permeate the rural populations. Was any one bold or courageous enough to openly profess and practice his faith, his loyalty to his God became a subject of derisive mockery to his fellow-men.

Once the popular passions had been thus excited against both royalty and the Church, it is not wonderful that *the financial embarrassments and oppressive taxes*, necessarily resulting from a lavish expenditure of the public funds and a neglect to develop the material resources of the country, should rouse the jealousy of the Third Estate, or commoners, against the immunities enjoyed by the clergy and nobles, the more so as these had now lost much of their former consideration and prestige, and, though wealthy, contributed nothing, except by voluntary gift, toward defraying the ordinary expenses of government.

The ideas of liberty imported from America; the enthusi-

East and West Indies, by *Raynal*, which appeared in 1758. In this work the author formally states that the world will never enjoy peace until it has been ridded of priests and kings. In the second edition, published in 1781, the same hatred of authority and religion is expressed still more vehemently. To the same class belongs also the Marriage of Figaro, by *Beaumarchais*, a caustic satire on all authority whatever, in which the nobility are handled with exceptional severity. To these may be added a flood of pamphlets, bearing neither the author's nor the printer's name.

Hosted by Google

asm naturally evoked by the successful struggle for independence in that country, to which France had so largely contributed in arms and money, and of which the young officers, on their return home, after sharing its trials and triumphs, were never tired of speaking in words of glowing eulogy, were like so many brands flung into a heap of inflammable matter. The impressionable genius of the French people, ever prompt to take up and ready to give a trial to whatever is new and strange, was fascinated by these ideas, and what was at first only a spark was rapidly transformed into a conflagration. Every measure taken to avert only served to hasten the crisis. The finances of the country were in a deplorable condition, and the efforts made by *Necker*, *Joly de Fleury*, and *Calonne*, who succeeded each other in the office of comptroller, to restore them, resulted only in increasing the yearly deficit. Calonne, conscious that a crisis was approaching, prevailed upon the king to call an *Assembly of Notables*, and on the 2d of February, 1787, opened that body with a speech, proposing several reforms, among which were the abolition of some of the privileges of the Notables and a more equitable distribution of the burdens of taxation, and closing with the startling confession that the yearly deficit had gone on steadily increasing till it now amounted to the sum of one hundred and fifteen millions of francs. The Notables refused to listen to the proposed reforms, and had Calonne disgracefully dismissed from his office, which was now given to Archbishop *Lomenie de Brienne*, who was shortly forced to resign, and the radical Necker was once more called to be Comptroller General of Finance. The excitement had now spread from one end of France to the other, and both the Nobles and the Third Estate demanded, each for a different reason, the convocation of the *States General*. The king for some time resisted the demand, but finally yielding, with ill grace, published the edict convoking the three estates to meet at Versailles, May 5, 1789, and, contrary to ancient usage, doubling the number of deputies representing the Third Estate. The excitement, which was steadily on the increase, was still further intensified by the general demoralization of the people, after passing through sufferings incident to an unusually rigorous winter

Hosted by Google

and by the nearness of the place of meeting of the States General to the city of Paris.[1] Moreover, it was well known that no reliance could be placed in the loyalty of the soldiers, who were daily to be seen in great crowds gathered about the Palais Royal, consorting with Radicals and partaking of their hospitality. The States General had barely assembled when the Third Estate demanded that the two orders of the nobles and clergy should unite with them to form one legislative body, and carry on their deliberations in a *common* chamber. This usage, though frequently followed since the restoration of the States General under Philip the Fair, had been departed from in the last assembly, held in 1614, when the privileged Estates deliberated in one chamber and the Third Estate in another. The demand was sternly resisted by the nobles and clergy, and equally sternly insisted upon by the Third Estate, who were somewhat emboldened by the encouragement they received from *Count Mirabeau*. Finally, on the 17th of June, after a stormy session, protracted long into the night, the Third Estate declared their own *the only lawful legislative body*, and of their own authority assumed the title of the *National Assembly*. This position had been long since boldly and persistently claimed for the representatives of the people by the *Abbé Sieyès*, Vicar General of the diocese of Chartres, and the author of the famous pamphlet "*What is the Third Estate?*" The leading idea of the pamphlet is this: Nothing is more reasonable than that the majority should rule. What is unreasonable should cease to exist. Now, if the king and the privileged Estates continue to be unreasonable, the people should take things into their own hands.

Expelled from his own order, Abbé Sieyès was with difficulty chosen one of the deputies of the Third Estate by one of the colleges of Paris. The deputies were immediately joined by eight parish-priests, one of whom was the Abbé Grégoire,[2]

[1] On the causes that led to the French Revolution, see *Ancillon*, who takes a temperate view, midway between the two extremes, Berlin, 1838, Vol. I., pp. 249 sq.

[2] Memoires de Grégoire († 1831), précédés d'une notice historique sur l'auteur, par *M. H. Carnot*, Paris, 1837, 2 vols.; *Krüger*, Grégoire, according to his Memoirs, with a preface by *Chas. Hase*, Lps. 1838. Cf. The Tuebingen Quarterly Review, 1838, nro. 4, p. 720–741.

Hosted by Google

and these were soon followed by one hundred and forty-eight more of the clergy, among whom were the Archbishops of Vienne and Bordeaux, the Bishops of Chartres, Coutance, and Rhodez, and *Talleyrand*, Bishop of Autun, who was really the leader of these disloyal ecclesiastics, and, by his personal influence, brought over to the liberal ranks one hundred and fifty of the priests of Paris. This was the man who subsequently ruled France for close upon a half a century, and who held it to be an axiomatic principle in politics "that speech was given to man, not to make known, but to disguise his thoughts." The king having given his assent to the union of the *three* estates, the name of States General was changed, June 19, 1789, into that of the *Constituent National Assembly*; and the Bourgeoisie, elated with the pride of victory and carried along with the spirit of revolution, broke through all restraint. On the 11th of July the *Marquis de Lafayette*, who, for services rendered in the War of American Independence, had been raised to the rank of general, brought forward the *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, which the more prudent *Mirabeau* wished to have deferred until after a constitution had been drawn up and adopted. His advice was disregarded, and, as a consequence of this precipitate action, a mob of fifty thousand men, on July 14, carried terror and dismay to every quarter of Paris; and, directing their steps to the Porte St. Antoine, where the *Bastille*, built by order of Charles V. as a defense against the English, was situated. Having effected an entrance, they were astonished to find only a few prisoners in the dungeons, where it was popularly believed there were scores; but so great was their hatred of this historical pile, on account of the eminence of the prisoners that had languished there, that on the following day they utterly demolished it. The National Assembly was not slow in usurping *political* power, and soon revealed its intentions of seizing the possessions of both the nobility and the clergy. The latter evinced a very conciliatory temper, and on the memorable night of the 4th of August came generously forward, offering to subscribe to any measures that might be thought necessary to liquidate the public debt. While the nobles expressed a readiness to lay aside their titles and the privileges of their

Hosted by Google

order, the clergy signified their willingness to pay taxes upon church-property, to surrender the tithes for a compensation, and to relinquish the surplice-fees and other perquisites. The *Jansenists* had hoped that the Church would emerge out of these troubles purified and more spiritual. When, on the 10th of August, these questions came up for discussion, the Archbishop of Paris, who for ten years had been styled the father of the poor, speaking in the name of the whole clergy, demanded that, in compensation for the tithes, some adequate provision be made for the proper maintenance of religion; that virtuous and zealous priests be set over the churches; that in the future, as in the past, the wants of the poor should not be neglected; and that, as there was at present no means of relieving them, the abolition of the tithes should be put off until such time as an appropriation from the public treasury could be set apart for this purpose, as well as for the support of the clergy. To these wise suggestions no answer other than a vague promise was given. A yearly income of seventy millions of francs was confiscated at a blow; and every individual of the privileged estates, excepting only such pastors and vicars as had barely a decent support (*portio congrua*), were subjected to an impost to go into immediate effect and to date back to the 1st of April, 1789.

The Assembly next took up the question of *religious liberty*, and, by a vote taken August 23, decided that in future every one should be free to hold what opinions, even in religion, he might see fit, provided only that in propagating them he did not violate either public peace or public law. It was plain that the aim of this measure was to *decatholicize France*, which even *Mirabeau* held to be necessary, on the ground that Catholicity and freedom are mutually incompatible! *The Declaration of the Rights of Man* was adopted August 26. The distress was steadily on the increase, and fresh sacrifices were demanded. Following the precedents of former ages, the noble Archbishop of Paris proposed to melt down all the sacred vessels not absolutely necessary to public worship, and to apply the proceeds to the paying off of the public debt. This generous offer was somewhat embarrassing to the Revolutionists, who, desirous of reducing the clergy to a condition

Hosted by Google

of dependence by robbing them of their possessions, nevertheless felt that to do so would appear little short of criminal. But any infirmity of this kind of which their consciences may still have been susceptible was speedily repaired by the boldness of the Bishop of Autun, who, on the 10th of October, brought forward a measure stating *that all ecclesiastical possessions ought to be declared national property, confiscated, and applied to the extinction of the public debt.* Neither the wise and temperate counsel of *Montesquiou*, nor the impassioned eloquence of *Maury*, nor yet the indignant rebuke of *Sieyès* himself, who, rising in his place in the Assembly, cried out, "You wish to be free, and you know not how to be just," could prevent the consummation of a financial measure at once so iniquitous and so replete with danger. On the 2d of November a decree passed the Assembly, placing all the property of the Church at the disposal of the Nation, and promising to make decent provision for the cost of worship, the support of the clergy, and the relief of the poor! During the discussion of this decree the hall of the Assembly was surrounded by an armed mob, crying out in menacing tones, "*that if the decision were favorable to the clergy the bishops and priests should be put to death.*" On the 19th of December following, ecclesiastical property to the value of two hundred millions of francs was sequestrated, put on sale, and declared to belong to the Nation. The violent measures enacted within the hall of the National Assembly were decorous and temperate, compared with what took place outside its walls. The tumultuous shouts of the deputies during their deliberations were caught up and sent back in fuller volume and greater intensity by the howling mob in the streets. After the taking of the Bastille, many regiments threw off the restraints of military discipline, and were with the greatest difficulty again reduced to obedience. The National Assembly now practically took the control of the army out of the hands of the king, by prescribing a new form of oath for the soldiers, according to which they bound themselves to obey the Nation first and next the crown, and never to use violence against their fellow-citizens. The throne was betrayed by the *Duke of Orleans.* From every street corner cheers went up for the

Hosted by Google

"*Declaration of the Rights of Man.*" Finally, on the 5th and 6th of October, a savage rabble, accompanied by members of the National Guard, raised the cry of "*Bread, on to Versailles!*" and, having arrived there, attacked the royal residence, and forced the king and the royal family to transfer their abode to Paris, whither the Assembly also followed. From this time forth the Revolution became inevitable; and the action of three hundred of the deputies, embracing all the more respectable members of the Assembly, who quitted Paris to avoid participating in the crimes which they saw would soon be perpetrated, only hastened the crisis. The Jacobins and patriots, who now openly proclaimed their intentions, and the Duke of Orleans, the leader of the Freemasons,[1] having no longer any reasonable cause of fear, set earnestly to work to carry into effect their long-meditated and audacious projects. On motion of the lawyer *Treilhard*, who asserted that the convent was the abode of tyranny, the prison of sorrowing hearts suffering in silence, and the scene of disorderly festivity and every sort of crime, the *monastic Orders* were abolished (February 13, 1790); and, as a compensation to the plundered monks and nuns, a miserable pittance, subsequently reduced to one-third the original sum, and even this never regularly paid, was granted to each. Then, as in the sixteenth century under Luther, might be seen troops of monks, though by no means so numerous as had been anticipated, carried away by the fury of the revolutionary torrent, several of them, like *Fouché* and *Chabot*, becoming the fiercest of Terrorists. On the 14th of April the entire administration of ecclesiastical property was handed over to the secular authorities, in spite of the spirited protest of the Abbé *Grégoire*, with the understanding that the administrators were to pay a salary to each member of the clergy, that of a parish-priest being set at twelve hundred francs, with the use of a house and garden. But before securing this indemnity to the clergy, or even granting them what was absolutely necessary for their sub-

[1] For the influence of the Order of Freemasons on the French Revolution, see *Barruel*, Mémoires, T. II., p. 257 sq., etc. *Polignac*, Hist., Polit., and Religious Studies, Vol. I., p. 56 sq.

Hosted by Google

sistence, an attempt was made to enslave them by forcing upon their acceptance the decree of July 12, 1790, known as the *Civil Constitution of the Clergy*. Not content with plundering the Church, they wished *to destroy her very constitution*, and thereby *decatholicize* France. It was decreed that there should be a bishopric for each of the departments into which the country had been recently divided, thus reducing the number of dioceses from one hundred and thirty-six to eighty-three;[1] that chapters should be suppressed, and all benefices, abbacies, and priories confiscated; that bishops and parish-priests should receive their appointments from the departmental electoral assemblies, composed of Catholics, Calvinists, and Jews; that bishops so appointed should dispense with the confirmation of the Pope, and receive investiture from the metropolitan, himself chosen in the same way; that as a matter of courtesy they might inform the Holy See by letter of their appointment; and, finally, that previously to being consecrated, they should, in the presence of the king, the municipality, the clergy, and the people, take the oath of allegiance to the Nation, the laws, and the king. The bishop was now only the parish-priest of his cathedral; the parish-priests of the other churches within his diocese composed his council, and according to their advice and judgment he was bound to be directed in the exercise of his authority; all dignities and prebends of cathedral and collegiate chapters were declared extinct; and, finally, all foreign bishops were forbidden to meddle in the affairs of the Church of France; but, with great difficulty, the Abbé Gregoire succeeded in having a modification introduced into the last clause, disclaiming any intention of prejudicing the existing union with the Visible Head of the Church. Such is the decree called by a misnomer the *Civil Constitution of the Clergy*, as if their civil

[1] The reader will find in *Mazas*, Vol. I., p. 67 sq., a list of the eighteen archbishoprics and one hundred and eight suffragan bishoprics, which still existed in 1789. He also gives a statement of the primitive revenues of the five sees dependent on the Metropolitan of Treves, and five others, forming the dioceses of Corsica. See, above all, *Dictionnaire de statistique religieuse*, published by *M. Migne*, Paris, Petit-Montrouge, 1851.

Hosted by Google

rights were at all in question.[1] The bishops entered their protest against the Constitution, earnestly demanding the convocation of a national or provincial synod; and the Abbé *Maury* pleaded eloquently to avert so great a disaster as this measure would inevitably bring upon France. Protests and pleadings were vain, and it was decreed that those performing ecclesiastical functions and refusing to take the oath to the civil constitution should be dismissed. The king, at whose request the affair was referred by the Holy Father to the judgment of de Pompignan, Archbishop of Vienne, and de Cicé, Archbishop of Bordeaux, long hesitated to sign the decree; but finally, on December 27, consented to yield, after the two prelates, with deplorable weakness, had advised the unqualified acceptance of the measure.

On motion of *Barnave*, a Protestant, it was enacted (January, 1791) that bishops and priests declining to take the oath to the Civil Constitution should, besides being deprived of their charges, be prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace, if they continued to exercise their functions. Scarcely had the decree been published when it was enforced in regard to the clerical members of the Assembly. Of the three hundred ecclesiastical deputies, about eighty consented to take the required oath, and these more from interest than conviction; and of the one hundred and thirty-six bishops of France, only four were to be found faithless to their trust. These were *Talleyrand*, Bishop of Autun; *Savines*, Bishop of Viviers; *Jarente*, Bishop of Orleans; and *Loménie de Brienne*, Archbishop of Sens. The Abbé Grégoire, in an address, explained the oath, and after setting forth the motives, which he thought sufficient to justify one in taking it, was the *first* ecclesiastic to swear obedience to the schismatical Constitution. At least fifty of the sixty thousand pastors and vicars then in France absolutely refused to take the oath. Those who took it were called *Assermentés* or *Jurors*, and those who refused *Insermentés* or *Non-jurors*. Many of those who took the oath did so because they had been intimidated or were ignorant of its

[1] *Sciout*, Histoire de la constitution du clergé (1790–1802), avec de nombreux documents inédits, Paris, 1873, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

real drift, and subsequently retracted; and many more sought to evade its import by explaining it away and putting their own interpretation upon it. Henceforth every priest was under suspicion; and although, as *Condorcet* said, there was no desire to make martyrs of them, their lives were daily threatened. Finally, as if at pains to leave no doubt concerning its religious views, the Assembly, by a decree of April 4, 1791, transformed the *Church of Sainte-Geneviève into a Pantheon*, or mausoleum, for the heroes and great men of France; and here *Mirabeau* was buried, and the remains of *Voltaire* and *Rousseau* subsequently transferred with great pomp. The nonjuring clergy were uniformly ordered to vacate their charges, which were then given to the constitutional clergy, consisting for the most part of apostate monks, fiery Revolutionists, and clerical refugees from Holland and Germany. About twenty parish-priests, who had exhibited in their persons shameless examples of perjury by taking the oath in the presence of the Assembly, were rewarded with bishoprics. One of them, the Abbé Grégoire, was set over the diocese of Blois, while Thémines, the lawful bishop, was still alive. To the king, who had done so much for this apostate priest, he showed his gratitude by demanding, *after the discovery of the flight of the royal family* by the postmaster of Varennes, the abolition of the prerogative of inviolability, which until that time had surrounded the royal person, and proposing to have him put on trial for his life. He appointed as his vicar-general *Chabot*, an infamous Capuchin friar, who, if possible, surpassed in cruelty even *Marat* himself. The first constitutional bishops were consecrated by Talleyrand, and these in turn consecrated others, all of whom took possession of their sees without the necessary permission of the Holy See. In April, 1791, Pope *Pius VI.* rejected the Constitution, declared the appointment of new bishops to sees illegal and of no effect, and suspended from the exercise of their functions those already consecrated. Many ecclesiastics retracted, submitted to the authority of the Head of the Church, and had their disabilities removed, thus escaping the scornful contempt with which the constitutional bishops and priests were regarded by the bulk of the people, who, to the surprise of many, were still

Hosted by Google

warmly attached to the old faith. To avenge itself upon the Pope, the National Assembly, on the 14th of September, declared, amid thunders of applause, the counties of *Avignon* and *Venaissin* annexed to France. As an initial token of the tender and beneficent care which the happy and peaceful inhabitants of the counties were to expect from their new masters, a mob, led by *Jourdan*, surnamed the *Beheader*, went about the streets of Avignon murdering men, women, and children in cold blood, and then, as if to put a fitting finish upon their atrocious deeds, drove one hundred and ten victims, many of whom were children and defenseless females, into the tower of the palace formerly occupied by the Popes, and chucked them, wounded, dead, and dying as they were, into a well, called the *Glacière* or ice-pit, after which they threw in a quantity of quicklime and water.[1]

In Paris an effigy of the Pope, after having been paraded through the streets of the city, sitting on an ass, and holding in its hands the figure of a bull, was removed and burnt amid the brutal jests of the mob.

The constitutional bishops and priests were by no means at one as to the line of policy they should pursue. Some wholly disregarded the numerous papal briefs effecting themselves; others affected to doubt their existence; and still others endeavored to persuade their parishioners that the new Constitution in no way clashed with the truths of faith or the discipline of the Church; that one might be a juror and at the same time a good Christian or an orthodox priest; and that in taking the oath they did so from the purest and most loyal of motives, and with no desire to outrage religion or the rights of the Holy See. But these fallacious assurances produced no effect, and were received by the faithful as being only the insidious echoes of the instructions which the National Assembly had addressed to the people on the 21st of January, 1791, on the subject of the Civil Constitution. When

[1] *Henry Martin*, in his History of France (Boston, Vol. I., pp. 208, 209), gives the details of this brutal butchery with a tone, if not of absolute approval, certainly not of condemnation. His work is intensely bigoted, and as an authority utterly worthless. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

persuasion would not accomplish their purposes, these apostles of reason very characteristically had recourse to threats and violence. Catholics who chose to remain loyal to their faith were persecuted, and non-juring ecclesiastics were cast into prison, driven from their respective dioceses, and banished the country.

§ 388. *Legislative Assembly* (1791–1792)—*National Convention* (September 21, 1792–October, 1795)—*Directory* (1796–1799)—*Consulate* (November 9, 1799)—*Theophilanthropists.*

The Constituent Assembly closed its sittings September 30, 1791, and the *Legislative Assembly*, as the next body was called, met October 1. This Assembly, acting under the inspiration of *Robespierre*, *Danton*, and *Marat*, carried out the principles of the Revolution with a logical rigor that was terrific and an impiety that was literally satanic. Ecclesiastics were forbidden to wear the dress of their order, and those of them, who refused to take the oath to the Civil Constitution, after having been already imprisoned and borne all manner of persecution for their heroic resistance, were now condemned to perpetual banishment. Louis XVI. declined to sanction the severe measures against the clergy, and, as long as he was free to choose his own spiritual attendants, closed the doors of the royal chapel in the face of the constitutional priests. His refusal was the occasion of a popular outbreak. The king was shortly after deposed and imprisoned in the Temple, and the decree against the clergy carried out in its extremest rigor. Although six hundred priests had been slaughtered at Avignon by the soldiers of Jourdan, the Beheader, they still heroically refused to take the oath. It was therefore resolved, on the very day of the king's imprisonment, August 13, 1792, to exterminate every Catholic priest in Paris. Under pretense of subsequently banishing them, the priests were searched for in every part of Paris, by order of the municipal authorities, and, when found, imprisoned in various quarters of the city. But, on the 2d of September, when news reached the city that the Prussians had already entered Champagne,

Hosted by Google

and were intent upon releasing the king and restoring his authority, a band of three hundred assassins, hired by the municipality of Paris, visited the various prisons, and, among other victims, massacred, amid scenes of revolting barbarity, three hundred ecclesiastics, including one archbishop and two bishops. The atrocities perpetrated in Paris were repeated at Meaux, Châlons, Rennes, and Lyons.[1] The carnival of blood continued for four days, during which eight thousand French citizens were put to death in Paris alone; and this wholesale assassination was characterized by the apologists of the Revolution as the shedding of the blood of a few *traitors!* One of the members of the Legislative Assembly declared publicly in one of the sessions "*that the one sorrow he would carry with him to the grave was that of having to leave behind him a religion existing on earth!*" Such of the priests as had been fortunate enough to escape the knife of the assassin quitted their parishes and went into voluntary exile. But these *emigrants* were not forsaken of God in a strange land. They were received with generous hospitality in Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Germany, and England. After getting through with persecuting priests, the legislators of the Assembly turned their attention to the protection of prostitutes; and those who had spoiled the Church and plundered ecclesiastics now voted a handsome sum for the relief of pregnant women of bad repute. They also legalized divorce, and, as a consequence, within the short space of two years, five thousand nine hundred marriages were dissolved in the city of Paris alone.

At the breaking out of the French Revolution, nearly all the princes of Europe remained for a time passive spectators, while the most sacred rights were being outraged,[2] and seemed to take no interest in what so nearly concerned themselves, until finally Leopold, Emperor of Austria, and Frederic Will-

[1] Cf. The Christian Heroes in the French Revolution, tr. fr. the Fr. into Germ., Mentz, 1820, and Abbé *Carron's* work, The Confessors of the Faith, quoted above at the heading of § 386. The Germ. transl. contains additions from *Guillon*, Les martyrs de la foi pendant la révolution française, Paris, 1821, 4 T.

[2] *Mazas*, Vol. I., p. 244, especially in the Appendix, p. 335–380.

Hosted by Google

iam, King of Prussia, after a meeting at Pilnitz, in August, 1791, issued a manifesto, declaring that they regarded the cause of Louis as their own, and calling upon all European princes to aid them in re-establishing law and order in France. In the meantime Leopold died, and was succeeded by Francis II., whose minister, Kaunitz, sent an ultimatum to Paris, demanding the re-establishment of the monarchy in all its rights, the restoration of the counties of Avignon and Venaissin to the Pope, and the surrender of the confiscated church-property in France. The Assembly received this extraordinary demand with feelings of indignation; and, with a daring that was all the more energetic and formidable because of its very recklessness, immediately declared war and openly defied all the enemies of France (April 20, 1792). This step was also necessary in order to change the fervid enthusiasm of the people in favor of liberty into a passion for war, and to anticipate and if possible prevent a coalition of all the powers of Europe against France and the Revolution. It would seem, says Boost, that there is an analogy between the physical and the spiritual laws in nature, and that the rapidity of a nation's descent in morals and religion, once it has been started on its downward course, is accurately expressed by the law of geometrical progression governing falling bodies. Accordingly, the bulk of the French people, following the teaching of false philosophers and the example of those who were socially and intellectually their superiors, cut loose from the Church, abandoned God, and having entered upon a downward course, dashed with blind fury into the most abominable excesses.

The direction of the Revolution had now passed into the hands of a mob, composed of the vilest of the vile, who, recognizing no rights in others, and outraging what every honest man held to be sacred, pretended that they were desirous of making all equal, when their only purpose was to bend the necks of others beneath their own yoke. The promised liberty and equality, Frenchmen learned to their cost, were nowhere to be found except on the field of battle, on the scaffold, and in the grave; and the boasted fraternity, which was to bind together all mankind in one common family, existed

Hosted by Google

only among the members of the Clubs, and its bond was a common hatred of all the human race beside themselves.

In the *National Convention*, which met September 21, 1792, Marat, Danton, and Robespierre, who had hitherto affected a certain modesty in pushing themselves to the front, now threw off all disguise, and at once took the government into their own hands. *Royalty* was forthwith abolished, the king was next brought to trial, condemned, and beheaded January 21, 1793. Against this judicial *murder by Frenchmen of one of the best of French kings* no determined opposition was made in the Convention, which was chiefly composed of Jacobins and Girondists. "I forgive the authors of my death," said this descendant of St. Louis with his last breath; "may my blood never be avenged upon France." These noble words will remain for all time a splendid testimony to the magnanimity and Christian resignation of this unfortunate prince. His queen, *Maria Antoinette*, the daughter of Maria Teresa, carried herself during the last days of her life, and amid the trying scenes of execution, with the heroic fortitude of a martyr and the calm dignity of a saint. The death of the king was the signal for a fresh and still more bloody persecution of the clergy, for a civil war of unparalleled barbarity, and for a series of proscriptions that included in their lists all that was great and noble and virtuous in France. Forty-four thousand Revolutionary Tribunals were established, and an equal number of guillotines set up over the face of the country, and a flying column of six thousand soldiers went up and down the land clearing it of every trace of both monarchical and aristocratic institutions. Amid the general destruction of whatever at any time contributed to the greatness and glory of France, *Christianity could not escape.* It was declared to be *of purely human invention and the persistent foe of freedom.* By the decree of 1792, granting universal toleration to every form of worship, Christianity *alone* was excepted. The philosophical principles that had been made familiar to the people were carried out to their last consequences in practice. Priests, against whom no charge could be brought except their heroic fidelity to duty, were brutally murdered; churches were profaned, pillaged, and, when not demolished, either sold or con-

Hosted by Google

verted into "*Temples of Reason;*" the Gregorian Calendar was abolished and replaced by the Revolutionary Era, commencing September 22, 1792, the *Decades* and the Revolutionary feasts;[1] marriage was declared a civil contract and nothing more; Christianity was abolished by a decree of November 7, 1793; *the worship of the Goddess of Reason* was established; the *existence of God* was publicly *denied;* and the last resting-places of the dead were violated, made desolate, and a card posted at the entrances bore the inscription: "*Death is but a perpetual sleep.*" Such are some of the results that succeeded each other with startling rapidity, once the Revolutionary movement had got fairly under way. The conduct of the constitutional clergy was simply deplorable. *Gobel*, the Constitutional Bishop of Paris, entered the hall of the Convention, followed by his clergy, on the 7th of November, 1793, and there, as if unconscious or heedless of the stain he was putting upon his own and their characters, openly declared that up to that time they had been duping the people and teaching a religion which they themselves believed to be false. "The people," said he, "want no public or national worship other than that of *liberty and equality*, and I bow my will to theirs, and here, upon the altar of my country, lay down my ring and crosier." While uttering these words, Gobel and the thirteen vicars, who followed his example, trampled under foot the tokens of their ministry, and in place of his mitre the unworthy bishop put upon his head the *red cap* or Phrygian bonnet.[2] Many of the constitutional clergy took wives, and one of them went the length of trampling the Crucifix under foot, crying out in the meantime: "It is not enough to destroy the tyrant of the body, let us also crush out the tyrant of the soul." Finally, on the 20th Brumaire (November 10, 1793) was celebrated in the venerable cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris the *feast of the Goddess*

[1] *Leo*, Manual of Univ. Ch. Hist., Vol. V., p. 88, but particularly pp. 114–117.

[2] He was soon overtaken by divine justice, and died on the scaffold April 13, 1794. In his prison he was touched by divine grace, and repented, exhibiting signs of deep sorrow for his sins and the scandal he had brought upon his holy religion. *Feller*, Dictionnaire historique, art. "Gobel."

Hosted by Google

of Reason, personified by an opera-singer of infamous character, borne aloft on a species of throne, with the Crucifix under her feet, and escorted to the church by legislators and philosophers, where, seated upon the altar and enveloped in a cloud of incense, she listened with grotesque composure while a crowd of amiable maniacs sang Chenier's hymn of Liberty in her honor. Those who had been most fanatically opposed to the veneration of the Saints became now the most enthusiastic proselytes of the new worship. They had a most tender reverence for the periwig and snuff-box of Rousseau, the sword of Mirabeau, and the hair that once adorned the fur robe of Voltaire.

A Consecrated Host, stolen from one of the churches, was carried in procession through the streets, amid the derisive jests and shocking profanity of the mob. As is always inevitably the case, schism produced heresy, and from this speedily followed atheism and paganism. Still irreligion was by no means general in France. *Brittany*, *Anjou*, and *Poitou* still nourished a noble race of men, *a veritable generation of giants*, who made a gallant and heroic stand for their king and the faith of their fathers. The Vendeans, though vanquished, had not fought in vain,[1] for the Revolutionary government was forced to grant them an honorable peace and *freedom of religious worship*. But the reign of terror did not on this account bear less heavily on the inhabitants of the other provinces of France. Any one known to conceal a nonjuring priest, on whose head a price was set, was liable to a large fine. The triumph of the Goddess of Reason was shortlived. Through the influence of Robespierre, the National Convention passed a decree recognizing the *existence of a Supreme Being* (*être suprême*), and professing a belief in *the immortality of the soul*. On the 8th of July, 1794, a magnificent and grotesque fête was celebrated in honor of the Supreme Being, over which Robespierre presided as high-priest, and was treated by the multitude almost as a demigod. There was never an age in the history of the world in which retributive justice was so swift to overtake the authors of crime as

[1] Cf. *Mazas*, Vol. II., pp. 131 sq., La guerre de la Vendée.

Hosted by Google

in this. And the most remarkable feature of their downfall and punishment is that these were invariably brought about by the *same* agents that had contributed to their elevation.

The Duke of Orleans, who sat in the Convention under the name of *Philip Égalité*, and who, though a near kinsman of the king, voted for his death amid a murmur of horror and disgust, being one of the suspected *Republican* deputies, lost his head November 6, 1793; *Marat* was stabbed to the heart by Charlotte Corday, who had come all the way from Caen to Paris to do the deed; *Danton* was beheaded April 5, 1794; and, finally, *Robespierre*, when at the height of his power, was conspired against by the very members of the Committee of Public Safety, followed into the Hôtel de Ville, and, when arrested, shot himself in the jaw in attempting to take his own life. Taken thence to the hall of the Convention, where, stretched upon a table, it is said the very clerks inhumanly pricked him with their penknives, he was condemned, and finally guillotined July 28, 1794, amidst the vociferous execrations of the multitude, who, a little more than a month before, had honored him as a demigod. Those who took the most conspicuous part in the Reign of Terror were nearly all guillotined on the very spot where their victims had suffered. After the fall of Robespierre the Convention returned to wiser and more temperate counsels. *Lecointre*, ascending the tribune in the hall of the Convention, courageously proclaimed "*that a people without a religion, without a worship, and without a Church, is a people without a country and without a morality, destined inevitably to sink to the condition of slaves; that contempt of religion had been the ruin of the French monarchy, and would be the ruin of every people whose legislation is not founded on the unchangeable principles of morality and religion.*" The decree of 1795, authorizing the exercise of Catholic worship in those churches not already alienated, was hailed by all wise and good Frenchmen as a great blessing.

Every one felt it a great relief, after the frightful days of the Reign of Terror, to be able to breathe freely once more, and to give expression to those exalted yet peremptory aspirations of the soul, which they had been obliged for so long to repress. "How delightful," said *Mercier*," is Christianity

Hosted by Google

after the moral code of Robespierre, Marat, and their colleagues! After such scenes of blood and horror, how great need have we that some one should speak to us of the God of peace!" Ecclesiastics were now only required to promise obedience to the laws of the Republic, and to recognize the principle of popular sovereignty. These concessions were the occasion of fresh persecutions, for even the terrible visitations of divine justice that had overtaken the Duke of Orleans, Mirabeau, Danton, Robespierre, Chabot, Gobel, and others, had not yet awakened in the minds of most Frenchmen a desire of returning to the Church of God.

The irreligion resulting from the rejection of Christianity began now to develop itself under another form. Under the patronage of the Directory (1796) a sect sprung up, known as *Theophilanthropists*,[1] composed of Jacobins, married priests, former members of clubs, and orators of political factions. This sect, which at first consisted only of five heads of families, who held meetings at irregular intervals,[2] after obtaining the protection of *La Réveillère-Lépaux*, gradually increased in numbers, got possession through its patron, who was one of the five members of the Directory, of ten of the parish-churches of Paris, and was received with favor in some of the provincial towns. The pure Deism professed by the sectaries could not hold its ground against cold Rationalism on the one hand or against the fervid earnestness of Christianity on the other. Pursued by the biting sarcasm of a scoffing public, Philanthropism passed out of sight, once its novelty had worn away, and was no more heard of after the *First Consul* had forbidden its professors, on the overthrow of the Directory, to exercise their worship in the churches. Although the nation had again returned to the true faith, the orthodox and loyal clergy had to put up with many annoyances from the more numerous constitutional ecclesiastics, who did every-

[1] They were also styled "*Theanthropophiles*," i. e. friends of God and men. See Manuel des Théophiles, Paris, 1797 (Germ., by *Friedel*, Mentz, 1798); Année religieuse des Théophilanthropes (recueil des discours), Paris, 1797; *Grégoire*, Histoire des Theophilanthropes (Germ., by *Stäudlin*, Hanover, 1806).

[2] It existed in England from the year 1776, where it was started by Franklin and Williams. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

thing in their power to impede the exercise of their jurisdiction. At a synod held in Paris (from Aug. 25, 1797), under the presidency of Bishop Grégoire, they partially revived the civil constitution of the clergy.

§ 389. *The Roman Republic.*

The civil constitution had been condemned by Pius VI. in the bull *Caritas*, and the clergy forbidden to take the required oath. After war had broken out between France and the other European powers, the Pope also levied an army for the defense of the Pontifical States. Such precautions gave offense to the French government, which, after the victorious campaign of Napoleon in Upper Italy against Austria, Sardinia, and Naples, declared war against the Holy See; and Pius VI. was in consequence obliged to accept an armistice, concluded in his name by Azara, the Spanish embassador; to surrender the Legation of Urbino, and to pay a war contribution of twenty-one millions of francs (1796). The Pope having resisted the demand made by Bonaparte to withdraw all the briefs issued against France, the armistice was declared at an end (February 1, 1797.) By a threatened advance upon Rome, Napoleon extorted from the Pope, by the Treaty of *Tolentino*, 19th of February, 1797, the cession of the counties of *Avignon* and *Venaissin* to France, and of the Legations of *Bologna*, *Ferrara*, and *Romagna* to the Cisalpine Republic. Besides these valuable provinces, the conqueror levied another heavy war contribution of thirty-one millions of francs, and plundered the libraries and galleries of Rome of some of the rarest manuscripts and most valuable treasures of art. These conditions brought the papal government to the very verge of ruin, although Napoleon declared "that he had given Europe an example of the moderation of the Directory." The peace did not last long. While the papal troops were engaged in putting down an insurrection in Rome, which the French had industriously encouraged, General *Duphot*, an *attaché* of the French embassy, was killed (December 28); and the Directory at once ordered General *Berthier* to advance upon

Hosted by Google

Rome, which he entered without opposition, February 10, 1798, and five days later *proclaimed a Republic.*

The popular party were as servile in their flattery of the French general as they were base and cruel in their treatment of the Sovereign Pontiff. A statue of the goddess of liberty, tramping under foot the tiara and other symbols of religion, was set up at one of the entrances to the bridge of St. Angelo; the papal insignia were derisively painted upon the drop-curtain in the theater Aliberti; and the sacred vessels stolen from the Altars were made to do service at the infamous orgies celebrated in honor of the Republic. To the thoughtful and better class of Romans these excesses showed how vitally important it was that the Holy Father should not leave the city. The Pope, on his part, fully appreciated his duty, and determined not to shrink from it. Having taken his resolution to stay with the people, the courageous octogenarian [1] refused to leave Rome until he was dragged from the Vatican by main force (February 20, 1798). He was next carried away to *Siena*, where he was lodged in the Augustinian monastery, and thence transferred to the Carthusian monastery of *Florence.* But the tender expressions of sympathy and respect which he received from the inhabitants roused the jealousy and excited the alarm of the philosophers and the Directory, and it was determined to send the grand old man either to Spain or Sardinia. This project was rendered impracticable by the breaking out of war, and the Pope, though in infirm health, was carried to Grenoble, whence, after a stay of twenty-five days, he was removed to Valence on the Rhône, and orders had already been given to move him on to Dijon, when, worn out by the rigor of his confinement, he passed peacefully away, August 22, 1799, in the eighty-second year of his age, thus escaping the trials of a fresh exile. He was in truth a "*Peregrinus Apostolicus moriens in exilio,*" and his last words were worthy the Vicar of Jesus Christ. "May my successor," said he, "whoever he may be, forgive the French as sincerely as I do."

The few trifling articles which the Holy Father had distributed as mementos and tokens of his gratitude to the faithful servants who had followed him into exile were seized by the French government and sold as *national property.* Such was the fear inspired by a government which claimed to be free and popular that the people did not dare even to bury the mortal remains of the holy Pontiff until an authorization had been sent to do so. His body was not interred until several months later, when Bonaparte, by a *Consular* decree, dated December 30, 1799, granted the required permission. Two years later, February 17, 1802, his remains were taken to Rome, and laid away in the Ba-

[1] "What a grand spectacle is Pius VI., when, with a firmness that few believe him capable of, he sternly resolves to remain near the Tomb of the Apostles and the Mother Church of Christendom, and there abide his fate! Would to God that the noble old man, now above eighty years of age, might be permitted to rest where he has spent a pontificate of two-and-twenty-years, and borne up under the bitter trials God has sent upon him." *John von Müller*, Autobiography, letter of March 4, 1797 (Complete Works, Vol. XXXI., p. 187). Cf., also, the memorable words of *Saracin*, of Geneva (New Hist. of the Church of Christ, 2d ed., Vol. I., pp. 66–68).

Hosted by Google

silica of St. Peter, amid universal tokens of respect and mingled expressions of joy and sorrow.[1]

B. § 390. *Pontificate of Pius VII.* (March 14, 1800–August 21, 1823.)

Continuatio Bullarii Rom. Pontificum Clementis XIII.–Gregor. XVI., T. XI.–XV. (Caprara) Concordat entre le gouvernement français et le pape, Paris, 1802. *Theiner*, Histoire des deux concordats conclus en 1801 et en 1813, Paris, 1869, 2 vols.; in opposition, *Crétineau-Joly*, Bonaparte et le concordat de 1801 et le Cardinal Consalvi, Paris, 1869. *Barruel*, Du pape et de ses droits relig. à l'occasion du concordat, Paris, 1803. *De Pradt*, Les quatre Concordats, Paris, 1818, 2 vols. Comte *d'Haussonville*, L'église romaine et le premier empire avec notes et correspond. diplomat., Paris, 1872. †*Artaud de Montor*, Histoire de la vie et du pontificat du pape Pie VII., 2 vols., Paris, 1837; tr. into English and Germ., Vienna, 2 vols. †Cardinal *Pacca*, Memorie storiche, Roma, 1832; translated into English by Sir George Head, 2 vols., post 8vo, London, 1850; Germ., Augsburg, 1831, 3 vols. † *Wiseman*, Recollections of the Last Four Popes and of Rome in their Times, London and Boston, 1858 (Germ., Schaffhausen, 1858). *J. Crétineau-Joly*, Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi, Paris, 1864; 2d ed., 1866, 2 vols. (Germ., Paderborn, 1870). Cfr. New Hist. of the Church of J. Christ. *Gams*, Hist. of the Church of Jesus Christ in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 26 sq.

At the death of Pius VI., Rome was still occupied by the French. Thirty-five cardinals, hastening from their several places of exile, assembled in *Venice*, and opened the conclave in the monastery of St. George the Greater, on December 1, 1799.

On the exclusion by Austria of the learned Cardinal *Gerdil*, a native of Savoy, then a part of France,[2] the cardinals, on March 14, 1800, gave their suffrages for *Gregory Barnabas*, of the family of *Chiaramonti*, the large-minded and charitable Cardinal-bishop of Imola, who took the name of *Pius VII.* His election marked the opening of a new era of triumph for the Catholic Church, and falsified the prophecies of the Parisian Clubbists, who confidently predicted that after the death of Pius VI. no Pope would ever again sit in the throne of St. Peter.

Pius VII. was crowned without the usual splendor of ceremonial, March 21, the feast of St. Benedict, whose habit he

[1] Cf. New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. I., pp. 152–156.

[2] See American Cyclopaedia, Vol. VII., p. 735, art. *Gerdil*. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

had worn. The monastery was for the time converted into the Quirinal, and the Church of St. George into the Vatican.

Francis II., Emperor of Germany, in whose dominions the Pope now found an asylum, appointed Marquis *Ghislieri*, of Bologna, his minister plenipotentiary at the Papal Court. Pius VII. also received the congratulations and the usual courtesies from the embassadors of the Courts of Sardinia, Naples, and Spain, the last named power being represented by the Patriarch of Antioch. Even Paul I., Emperor of Russia, sent a bishop to Venice to assure the Pope that he would respect and protect the interests of Catholics in those provinces which, by the Partition of Poland (1794), had passed under the government of his Empire.

The Romans were ardently longing for the day when the Pope's temporal power would be restored to him, and, though still under the dominion of France, sent an embassy to carry to Pius VII. the expressions of their respect to his person, and the assurances of their submission to his authority. Owing chiefly to some successes of the allied armies and partly also to a desire on the part of Napoleon to restore religion in France, the Pope re-entered Rome shortly after (July 3), amid the unbounded enthusiasm of the inhabitants, his first act being to pay a visit to the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's Church. The Pope's first efforts were directed toward repairing the damage the revolution had wrought both among his people and in the Church, and his plans for effecting these two objects were fully set forth in an *encyclical*, issued sometime later. The papal authority was re-established in Acona and Perugia; the tax on corn was abolished; and *Consalvi* was appointed Pro-secretary of State. The public debt had increased to 50,000,000 of francs, and to help to pay it the Pope reduced the revenues of the Papal Palace from 150,000 to 36,000 scudi. He also published edicts for the restoration of morals, and proclaimed a political amnesty, from which only the ringleaders in the late revolutionary troubles were excluded. But events soon took place which rendered some modification in the administration of the Pontifical government necessary.[1]

[1] See New Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 113–120. Cf., also, Dis-

Hosted by Google

By the victory of Marengo, June 14, 1800, the whole of Northern Italy passed under the dominion of the French, and after some more reverses the Austrians were forced to accept the conditions of the *Peace of Lunéville*, February 9, 1801, by which the Adige was declared the boundary of the Austrian States in Italy, the Cisalpine Republic recognized, and the Pope obliged to cede the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara, Forli, and Ravenna. The Pope now evinced an ardent desire to establish friendly relations between France and the Holy See.

Napoleon, who had been named First Consul, December 15, 1799, was equally anxious for a reconciliation, but was probably actuated more by motives of policy than by love of religion. He was well aware that the hatred of the Jacobins against the Church was not shared by the bulk of the people; and he was also fully convinced that it is impossible to rule over a people destitute of religion, and that to restore order and peace to the *State* it was absolutely necessary to re-establish the Catholic Church. By this act he secured the gratitude of the faithful ministers of religion, who declared "*that blessings would necessarily attend the power that was instrumental in setting up again the overturned Altars of the churches.*" It is also quite possible that he counted upon the glory and prestige with which an act so acceptable to the nation would undoubtedly surround him, as making easy his way to the throne to which he aspired. He therefore sent, through Cardinal de' *Martiniani*, Bishop of Vercelli, a request to the Holy Father to send plenipotentiaries to France, with authority to regulate all ecclesiastical affairs. In compliance with this wish, Pius VII. sent as his envoys to Paris *Spina*, Archbishop of Corinth, and *Caselli*, subsequently General of the Servites, who, with *Joseph Bonaparte*, the First Consul's brother, *Cretet*, Councillor of State, and *Abbé Bernier*, all selected by Napoleon, set about adjusting the relations of Church and State in France.[1]

course of Pius VII. on the tribulations of the Church, p. 10–16, and his Encyclica of May 25, *ibid.*, p. 46–52; also *Consalvi's* Memoirs, p. 416.

[1] Concerning what follows, cf. *ibid.*, Vol. I., p. 127–140. The Latin text of the Concordat is found in *Robiano*, Vol. II., p. 459–469. The Bulla novae circumscriptionis dioecesium, *ibid.*, p. 469–477, and pp. 478, 479. Information on

Hosted by Google

M. *Cacault* was sent as minister plenipotentiary to the Papal Court, with orders to treat the Pope with all the respect due to his position.[1] Grave difficulties were at first encountered. The bond of unity had been snapped by the civil constitution of the clergy in 1791, and had not been closed since; all the bishoprics in France had been usurped by the constitutional bishops, even during the lifetime of the lawful incumbents; and canonical investiture, as well as the property of the clergy, were in the hands of laymen. Notwithstanding that the plenipotentiaries on both sides had the very best of intentions, and had actually agreed on a great many points, they were not successful in drawing up a concordat wholly satisfactory to the powers they represented. The Pope, who had in the meantime assembled a congregation *a latere* for the special purpose of dealing with the questions involved in the concordat, now sent to Paris Cardinal *Consalvi*, one of its leading members, with full authority to make any concessions which he might judge to be for the good of religion, and compatible with the rights of the Holy See. When Consalvi arrived at Paris, June 22, 1801, he was surprised to learn that the First Consul had that very day assembled the constitutional bishops and parish-priests in synod, an event which it was clear would greatly complicate the difficulties of his mission. The synod was opened June 29, 1801, by *Grégoire*, its president, whose propositions were so extravagant that Napoleon, displeased with them, concluded a concordat of seventeen articles with Consalvi, July 15, regulating ecclesiastical affairs in France, and dissolved the so-called national synod.[2] The important question, and the one most difficult of settlement, concerning the lawfulness of the titles by which the bishops held their sees, was summarily disposed of by an exercise of

the circumscription of the new dioceses is likewise found in *Mazas*, Vol. II., p. 273 sq.

[1] When taking leave of Napoleon, Cacault asked him how he should treat the Pope. "Treat him," replied Napoleon, "as if he were the master of 200,000 men; and bear in mind that I aspire to the honor of being, not the destroyer, but the savior of the Holy See." *Thiers*, Hist. du Consulat et de l'Empire.

[2] *Gams*, Hist. of the Christian Church in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 130–141.

Hosted by Google

the plenitude of papal authority. The Pope regretted being obliged to resort to so extreme a measure, but felt that the extraordinary and abnormal circumstances of the Church in France, and the necessity of prompt and energetic action to prevent schism and avert persecution, alike rendered his course imperative. By the bull *Qui Christi Domini* he called upon the old bishops holding sees in France by lawful title, but now dispersed and living in exile in the various countries of Europe, to resign, and of the eighty still surviving, forty-four at once sent in their resignations, besides fourteen, whose sees were situated in territory recently annexed to France; but the thirty-six others refused. The fifty-nine constitutional bishops were also requested by both the Pope and the government to surrender their authority and rights into the hands of the Consuls, which they had no alternative but to do. The following are the most important provisions of the *Concordat:*[1] The Roman Catholic religion, being that of *the vast majority* of Frenchmen, shall be freely practiced throughout all France, subject to no restriction except the police regulations intended to preserve order and public peace. The Holy See, acting in concert with the government, shall define the boundaries of the new dioceses. The Pope will inform the lawful bishops of the old dioceses that in the interests of peace and unity he confidently hopes they will resign their sees; should they refuse, he will take no notice of their action, but proceed to fill the newly-created sees with incumbents. The First Consul shall make all *nominations* to archbishoprics and bishoprics, and the Holy See confer canonical institution. Before entering upon the functions of their offices, bishops shall take the oath of allegiance, according to the ordinary form, by placing their hands between those of the First Consul; and ecclesiastics of the second rank shall take the same oath in the same way, in presence of officers appointed by the government to receive it. Bishops shall

[1] Given in the French original text by *Walter*. Fontes jur. canon., p. 187–190; in Latin, by *Robiano*, Vol. II., p. 459; in German, by *Gams*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 114 sq. For a list of the new sees, together with the determination of their limits, see *Mazas*, Vol. II., p. 273 sq. Cf. New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Vol. I., p. 142–153, and p. 175–190.

Hosted by Google

establish the boundaries of parishes within their respective dioceses, subject, however, to the authorization of government. The bishops shall have the right of appointing pastors, but shall select no one obnoxious to the government. The Pope, on his part, promises that neither he nor his successors will in any way disturb those in possession of the ecclesiastical estates seized and sold as national property during the Revolution; and, on his part, the First Consul, in the name of the government, pledges himself to make adequate provision for bishops and priests, and to sanction any new foundations persons may be disposed to make in behalf of the Church. The Pope recognizes and respects in the First Consul all the rights and prerogatives enjoyed by those at the head of the old government.

When the provisions of the Concordat became known at Rome the cardinals disagreed, some favoring and some opposing their acceptance; but Pius VII., after weighing the reasons brought forward by the advocates of both parties, made up his mind to ratify it, and drew out his reasons for doing so in a brief, dated August 13; and, in a second one, dated two days later, he earnestly besought those French bishops who still declined to resign to come generously forward and make the sacrifice in the interest of religion and for the welfare of the Church. He then commissioned Cardinal *Caprara*, Archbishop of Bologna, to go to Paris, and invested him with full power to carry out every provision of the Concordat. Although the Concordat met with no little opposition in France, it was accepted by the First Consul,[1] who, however, published simultaneously with it a code of "*Organic Laws*," with, it was supposed, a view of rendering the acceptance of the Concordat less objectionable to the *Corps législatif*, by which it was ratified April 5, 1802. These *Laws* are in substance as follows:[2]

[1] *Gams*, Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 124 sq.

[2] For the French original text, see *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., p. 190–198; see also *Gams*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 156 sq.; Vol. II., p. 25 sq. For elucidations, see *Archives* of Canon Law, year 1872, nro. 6.

Hosted by Google

"No bull, brief, rescript, or mandate; no provision or enactment of any kind whatever coming from the Holy See, even should these refer only to individual and single cases, shall be received, or published, or printed, or carried into effect without leave from the government. Bishops shall be amenable for misdemeanors to the Council of State, which, if a case be made out against the arraigned, shall be competent to pass a vote of censure (*déclaration d'abus*). Professors in seminaries shall teach the Four Articles of the Declaration of the French Clergy; and bishops shall inform the Minister of Public Worship of their various engagements. No synod may be held in France without leave of government. Priests having charge of *parochial chapels* shall be removable without canonical process. On the death of a bishop, his see shall be administered by his metropolitan, or, he failing, by the senior bishop of the province. Vicars-general shall continue to exercise the functions of their office after the death of the bishop and until his successor has been inducted. Parish-priests shall give the marriage blessing only to those who can prove that the marriage ceremony has been already performed before a civil magistrate.[1] The parish-registers shall be valid evidence as to the reception of the Sacraments, but shall not be received as proof of what is purely a civil matter."

These enactments sufficiently show that the First Consul either would not or dared not adopt so liberal a policy toward the Church as had been anticipated.

The Pope protested, but in vain, that these Laws had not been submitted to him. The Concordat was, however, executed all the same, and its promulgation was celebrated in the Church of France by a solemn feast, April 18, 1802. The Democrats and Napoleon's companions in arms sneered at this ceremony, which, they said, was the latest comedy, and boasted that the French flag had never been more glorious than since the day it had ceased to be blessed. Napoleon asked General *Delmas* how the celebration pleased him, and the latter is reported to have said "that it was a pretty capuchinade, and to complete it required only the presence of the two millions of men who had been sacrificed in pulling down what the First Consul was now engaged in building up." Still the purpose of Napoleon was unshaken, and that he was fully satisfied with what he had done is shown by his

[1] Cf. *Friedberg*, Hist. of Civil Marriage, Berlin, 1871.

[2] Cardinal Caprara was very active in this matter. Concerning his appointment to the post of Legate *a latere*, and the documents investing him with authority to establish new bishoprics and to grant indulgences in the same manner as they are granted on occasion of jubilees. Cf. *Robiano*, Vol. II., pp. 487–492. *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 155–161.

Hosted by Google

words, uttered at St. Helena, when he had no longer any motive to disguise his real thoughts. "I have never regretted signing the Concordat," said he. "I had to have one of some kind, either that one or another. And had there existed no Pope, it would have been necessary to create one." The religious reaction setting in was everywhere visible. Its influence was marked on most of the literature of the day. It first manifested itself in the works of *Saint-Martin* († 1804), who, because the reveries of Jacob Boehm, Swedenborg, and Pordage had a greater fascination for his mind than the teachings of the Church, did not exert the influence that should be looked for from one of his high moral character and unusual intellectual gifts. He wove into grotesque and fantastical forms the mystical ideas of nature contained in the works of Boehm and others, thus piecing out a sort of mystico-theosophic system, which he propagated chiefly among the Freemasons of the higher degrees.[1] *Martin Ducrey* did good service in the cause of God by the school which he opened at *Sallanches* (after 1800), and still later by the Carthusian monastery founded by him at Malan. But the one who beyond all others contributed to the restoration of religion and the glorifying of the Christian name at this time was unquestionably *Chateaubriand*, who, with his eloquent pen, touched the hearts of all Frenchmen, and enlisted them in a cause that had long since been set aside and made to give place to the subjects that filled the literature of the day. During the early days of his life he had drifted into scepticism and infidelity; but, moved by the appeal of his dying mother, he returned to the faith of his youth, and, as an evidence of his sincerity, wrote the *Genius of Christianity*. "My religious convictions," he said, writing when advanced in life, "were not always as fixed as they are now. Annoyed at what I regarded as the abuses of some institutions, and indignant at the vices of some men, I fell into sophistical and declamatory habits; but

[1] Des erreurs et de la vérité par un philosophe inconnu, Lyon, 1775; Tableau naturel des rapports qui existent entre Dieu, l'homme et l'univers, Lyon, 1782, showing that we must explain things by man and not man by things; L'Homme de désir, Lyon, 1790; Ecce Homo, Paris, 1792, Lps. 1819; De l'esprit des choses, Paris, 1800, 2 vols.; Oeuvres posthumes, Tours, 1807, 2 vols. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Divine Providence graciously deigned to recall me to a sense of my duty."[1]

The public had been prepared for the promulgation of the Concordat by a series of articles in the newspapers. The bulk of the nation, however, had always regarded the impious excesses of the Revolution with horror, and required no such adventitious encouragement to return to the faith of their fathers. It soon ceased to be fashionable among cultivated people to sneer at religion, and to be known as an enthusiastic patron of religious literature gradually came to be regarded as a mark of good breeding. As it had been formerly the *mode* to deride the Church, her teaching and her practices, so it became now a mark of bad taste to manifest the least disrespect for either her dogma or her worship.

The Christian tone of the language in which *Atala* was written, the stern yet touching scenes of this Christian romance, and the poetic grace and fascinating magic of its style, all powerfully contributed, not alone to widen the narrow limits within which the poetry and language of France had been hitherto confined by severe laws, but also to shake off the feelings of indifference that had so long rested upon a thoughtless yet vivacious and religious people. The publication of the work, in fact, marked the beginning of a literary, moral, and religious revolution in France.[2]

[1] "When in her seventy-second year," he goes on to say in his *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe*, "my mother was cast into a frightful prison. In this gloomy abode, whither she had been driven by dire misfortune, she saw several of her children perish about her, and there, too, she ended her own life. In her dying moments she called one of my sisters to her side, bidding her to bring me back to the religion in which I had been brought up. Through my sister I learned the last wish of my mother. After the latter had passed away, my sister also followed, falling a victim to the rigors of her imprisonment. These two voices, speaking to me from out the grave, the death of the one being the interpreter of the death of the other, came with special force upon me. I became a Christian. *Weeping, I believed.*"

[2] *Chateaubriand*, Atala, ou les Amours de deux sauvages, Paris (1801). The episode of Atala was incorporated in his *Génie du Christianisme*, ou Beautés de la religion Chrétienne, Paris, 1802, 2 vols. *Les Martyrs*, the most admired of his works, appeared in 1809, 2 vols.; his Itinerare de Paris à Jerusalem, Paris, 1811, 3 vols. Most of his works have been translated into English, German, and other languages. The Genius of Christianity, tr. by *Chas. White*, Balti-

Hosted by Google

Ecclesiastical seminaries, both greater and lesser, were opened all over the country, but chiefly in the metropolitan and suffragan sees, and conducted strictly according to the instructions laid down in the decrees of Trent. Priests, by request of government, resumed their distinctive dress; and the piety of the faithful made generous provision for institutions and communities founded for the education of the young and the care of the sick. Remarkable conversions were of daily occurrence. *Laharpe*, while languishing in prison, read the *Following of Christ* (1794), and was so deeply affected by its profound yet simple truths that he returned to the faith, and in a codicil to his last will withdrew whatever errors were contained in his works (February 11, 1803). New dignitaries restored in a measure her former luster to the Church. *Du Belloy*, Archbishop of Paris; *de Boisgelin*, of Tours; *Cambacérès*, of Rouen; and *Fesch*, of Lyons, were created cardinals. The *Jubilee*, which was opened March 10, 1804, also contributed largely toward leading men's minds back to the practices of religion. Still the Concordat met with some opposition, and to overcome it the Cardinal Legate addressed a circular letter to the French bishops.

The efforts of Cardinal *Caprara* to restore order and re-establish the authority of the Church throughout France were ably seconded by the indefatigable and pious Abbé *Barruel*. Henceforth certain congregations, among others the *Priests of the Missions*, the *Brothers of Christian Doctrine*, the *Hospitaller Sisters*, and the *Sisters of Charity*, to whose undoubted utility and beneficent ministrations Napoleon himself bore testimony, were recognized by government and their establishments authorized by law. The *Congregation for Foreign Missions* was under the special protection of the government, and received government aid in carrying out the objects of its foundation.

After peace had been concluded by General *Brune* between the Ottoman Porte and France, the latter country became

more, 1856. Complete Works, best ed., by *Sainte-Beuve*, 12 vols., 1859–1861. Part of a new and complete illustrated edition, to consist of 14 vols., has appeared (Paris, Sarlit) since 1864. See *Villemain*, Chateaubriand, sa vie, ses écrits, son influence sur son temps, etc., which appeared in 1858, in 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

once more the protector of the churches of the Latin rite in the Levant; and General Sebastian, while traveling through Egypt, Syria, and the Ionian Islands, had frequent occasion to exercise this newly-acquired right, which he did by order of the French government.

Napoleon having been proclaimed *Emperor* of the French by a "senatus consultum," May 8, 1804, sent many urgent invitations to the Pope to come to Paris to crown him, that thus an empire that had been the reward of victory might receive the consecration of religion.[1] After some hesitation, Pius VII., regardless of the opposition of the other European powers, and of the solemn protest of Louis XVIII., resolved to comply; because, as he said in a Consistory held October 29, by making the journey he would have an opportunity of conversing personally with the Emperor, and thus advancing the interests of *religion;* and he took Heaven to witness that in doing what he was about to do he had no object in view other than the glory of God, the weal of souls, and the good of the Catholic *religion*.[2]

Accompanied by four cardinals, four archbishops, and two prelates, the Holy Father set out from Rome on the 2d of November, amidst the tears of his people, and, after crossing the Alps in the depth of winter, began his journey through France, which was one continuous triumph, when, as the Pope said himself, "he moved through a nation on its knees." The ceremony of *coronation* took place in the cathedral of Notre Dame, December 2d;[3] the Emperor taking the crown that

[1] Comte *d'Haussonville*, L'église romaine et le premier empire, 1800–1814, 5 vols., Paris, 1872.

[2] From this may be seen how little importance is to be attached to the assertion of the Abbé de Pradt, who said that the Pope, in making this journey, had not the interests of religion in view; that his object, which was wholly political, was to obtain the restitution of the three legations. (Tr.)

[3] By request of the Pope, Napoleon's marriage with Josephine de la Pagerie, the widow of Viscount de Beauharnais, contracted in 1796 according to the civil form, was on this occasion solemnized according to the *essential rite* prescribed by the Council of Trent. At eleven o'clock at night, on the eve of the coronation, a chapel was prepared in the Emperor's apartments, and at midnight the Emperor and Empress received the nuptial blessing from Cardinal Fesch. The witnesses to the marriage ceremony were Portalis and Duroc, the

Hosted by Google

had been blessed by the Pope and placing it upon his own head, and afterward crowning Josephine as Empress.

The universal tokens of religious respect and filial love with which the French people had welcomed the Holy Father were not less marked after the ceremony of coronation had taken place. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris gave eloquent expression to the sentiments that filled the minds of all. "In vain," said he, "have the enemies of the Church been multiplied; their very name has passed away into the night of time; scarcely a trace can be found of their existence. . . . O, Holy Roman Church! ages have passed over thee, and thou art still triumphant; thou hast ever overcome impiety by preserving purity of morals, integrity of doctrine, and uniformity of discipline, as these came to thee from thy Divine Founder and His Apostles." The respectful homage joyfully rendered by persons of every rank and condition of life to the Holy Father soon roused the jealousy of the Emperor, who showed the annoyance such marks of sympathy caused him in a way at once unworthy of himself and painful to his august host. The Holy Father was compelled against his will to spend the remainder of the winter in Paris, and was not even permitted to make such visits as his pious solicitude suggested.

In the course of the many interviews he had with the Emperor, however, he obtained for the bishops the free exercise of their authority, removed the obstacles that until then had stood in the way of young men aspiring to the priesthood; initiated many measures providing for the spiritual welfare of the sick and of the army, and did much good in other ways. But his earnest demands for the restitution of the Legations and the revocation of the *Organic Laws* were to no purpose; the Emperor firmly refused to yield. It was only when the Emperor passed the Alps to receive the Iron Crown of the Lombards as King of Italy, May 26, 1805, that the Pope, forming, as it were, one of the Imperial retinue, was permitted to return to his States. While on his way home, the Pope was again the object of enthusiastic expressions of public joy, and the fêtes celebrated in his honor at Lyons and Turin in some sort rivalled in magnificence those gotten up for the Emperor himself.[1] But the Pope had still holier and sweeter consolations, for, during his stay in Turin, by his personal influence, he persuaded the archbishop to resign his see, the latter thus complying with a request that had been frequently made and as frequently refused. *Scipio Ricci*, Promotor of the schismatical Synod of Pistoia, also manifested a sincere disposition to be reconciled to the Church. Arrived at Rome, the Pope again took the administration of affairs into his own hands; and, while giving his best energies to the government of the Universal Church, found time to devote to the encouragement of the arts within his own States.

Grand Marshal of the Palace. These circumstances were kept from the public. *Rohrbacher*, Ch. Hist. (Tr.)

[1] New Hist. ot the Church of Christ, Bk. II., pp. 306–313.

Hosted by Google

§ 391. *Disagreement between the Pope and the Emperor.*

Fragmens relatifs à l'histoire eccl. des premières années du XIX. siècle, Paris, 1814. Correspondance authentique de la cour de Rome avec la France depuis l'invasion de l'état Romain jusqu'à l'enlèvement du Souverain Pontife, 1809. *Jaeger*, Biography of Pius VII., Frankfort, 1825. For the works of *Pacca*, *Artaud*, Vol. II., *Wiseman*, see bibliography, heading, § 390. Mémoires du Card. *Consalvi*, Paris, 1864; 2d ed., 1866, 2 vols., Germ., Paderborn, 1870.

The dislike which the Emperor manifested toward the Pope during the stay of the latter in Paris was not a passing feeling; it was deep-seated, and grew more intense and pronounced as time went on.

The Emperor had made use of the influence of the Pope to give to his authority the sanction of *religion* in the eyes of the people, and had caused an insertion to be made in a French catechism, recently published, to the effect "that any one resisting the authority of the Emperor, who had been consecrated by the Pope, risked his eternal salvation; and that one of the first duties of a Christian was to do military service for one who had restored the authority of the Church." But he was not yet content. That there should exist in the world an authority which men regarded as superior to his own was a source of annoyance to him; and, as he had bent the scepters of kings to his imperial will, so he also conceived the design of making the Pope do his pleasure. But to accomplish this it was necessary to begin open hostilities against the Holy See, and pretexts for an outbreak were easily found.

Immediately after his coronation at Milan, May 26, 1805, he published several decrees highly prejudicial to the interests of the Church. He appointed a Commission, which was charged with the duty of enforcing in Italy the "*Civil Code*" of France, without the least modification, and, in direct contravention of the Concordat[1] entered into between the Holy See and the Cisalpine Republic, took upon him to appoint to Italian bishoprics. The Pope declined to confer canonical institution, and here the matter rested until the close of the campaign of 1805. To a request from the Emperor to declare null the marriage contracted by his brother *Jerome* with Miss Patterson, in Baltimore, U. S., while still in his non-age, the Pope replied that with his present information he could not comply. The Emperor cut the matter short by having the marriage declared void by the civil tribunals, and Jerome was shortly afterward

[1] New Hist., etc., Book II., pp. 261 sq.

Hosted by Google

married to a princess of Würtemberg. "The King of England and the Emperor of Russia," Napoleon was wont to say, "are masters in their own houses. In the religious affairs of their dominions they are absolute and without control." Such was the commencement of a project, the ultimate aim of which was the annihilation of the Holy See. These beginnings were followed up *by the seizure and occupation of the port and city of Ancona;* by the consequent violation of the neutral territory of the Pope, which had thus far been respected by all the belligerent powers, thus exposing the States of the Church to be the theater on which reprisals would be made against France; by demanding, some time later, the dismissal of such embassadors from the Papal Court as were personally obnoxious to him; and, finally, by ordering the Pope to expel all English citizens from his States, and to close his harbors against English vessels, threatening, if his wishes were not complied with, to occupy the March of Ancona with imperial troops.[1] "You are sovereign of Rome; I am Emperor; my enemies should also be yours." Such is the imperious and novel logic employed by Napoleon, in a letter addressed to the Pope, on the 13th of February, 1806. Repelling a pretension which would involve the Father of Christendom in wars, it mattered not for what purpose or against whom they might be waged, whenever it suited the imperial pleasure to declare them, the Pope replied that he could not consistently with his honor or his conscience enter into an alliance which would draw upon him the enmity of all the Emperor's adversaries, and make him a partner to a universal and permanent war; and that he could not begin hostilities against a government which, like that of England, had done him no wrong. "Far from acceding to such a demand," added the Pope, "a minister of peace, representing the God of peace, should call unceasingly upon Heaven to put an end to war and to restore universal peace and concord." Wounded by the tone of the Pope's reply, the Emperor rejoined, as if the Holy See were then what it had been in the Middle Ages, that Pius VII. held such language toward him as a Gregory VII. might, and that, owing to his own great forbearance, so out of keeping with his true character, and so contrary to his usual policy, the belief had undoubtedly gained ground at Rome that the thunders of the Vatican had terrors for him.

The Pope, however, was not frightened by these threats. Napoleon believing that Pius VII. was under the control of Consalvi, styled the "*Syren of Rome,*" demanded the resignation of the latter, and he was accordingly replaced by Cardinal Casoni, then seventy-four years of age. After the seizure of the Principalities of Ponte-Corvo and Benevento, and their incorporation into the kingdom of Naples, the former was given as an imperial fief to the Protestant General Bernadotte, and the latter to Talleyrand, then French minister for foreign affairs, and formerly Bishop of Autun.

Indignant at so flagrant an outrage, the Papal government ceased to transact any further business through Cardinal Caprara, the Legate at Paris, conducting all affairs of State with France directly from Rome. In answer to the Emperor's insolent letter, just referred to, the Pope sent word that he must decline to unconditionally acknowledge Joseph Bonaparte as King of Naples. "Your Majesty," he wrote to the Emperor, "is conscious of power; but We

[1] New Hist., etc., Bk. II., pp. 339–347, where the Pope's answer is given.

Hosted by Google

know that there is a God above all the monarchs of the earth, who is the avenger of justice and innocence, and to whom every human authority is subject." Napoleon replied, in a note of January 7, 1808, by making six new demands, which were equivalent to a declaration of war.[1] Shortly after (February 2, 1808) General *Miollis* entered Rome at the head of a French army, and on the same night the Pope drew up a protest in his own name and that of his successors against the occupation of his territory, and directed that a copy be sent to each of the foreign embassadors then in the city. This provoked fresh outrages. The papal troops were incorporated with the French army, and such officers as resisted were sent to Mantua. Four cardinals were carried away to Naples as state criminals; ten more were led back under military escort to the various countries from which they had come; the Swiss Guard was disarmed in front of the papal palace, and the Noble Guard shut up in the Castle of Sant' Angelo. To the renewed protests of the Pope's Secretary of State the French embassador replied "that these were only the consequences of refusing to comply with the wishes of the Emperor, who is determined to unite all Italy into a league, offensive and defensive, and thus banish war and disorder from the peninsula." "By this refusal," he continued, "the Holy Father, while protesting that he does not want war with the Emperor, declares it against him. Now, war leads directly to conquest, and conquest to a change of government in the conquered States. This, however, would not deprive the Pope of his spiritual rights; he would still continue Bishop of Rome, as his predecessors were during the first eight centuries and under Charlemagne. It is a source of grief to the Emperor to see the products of genius, statesmanship, and civilization going to ruin, because of an unreasonable obstinacy and blindness." The Pope replied in a note of April 19, in which he said that since the Emperor was deaf to the voice of justice, there was no way of preventing him from taking possession of the States of the Church by conquest; but, at the same time, he felt called upon to solemnly protest that, being at peace with the whole world, there was no justification for the act, and that it must be characterized as a violent and unprecedented usurpation. While these negotiations were going forward, the decrees of Napoleon were being carried out, declaring the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camerino irrevocably incorporated with the kingdom of Italy, and ordering all cardinals, prelates, and servants of the Court of Rome to return to the kingdom of Italy before the 25th of May, under penalty of confiscation of all their goods.[2] The real purpose of the last clause was the dissolution of the College of Cardinals, twenty-four of whom had been already sent into exile. The Pope again protested, but in vain, the Emperor relaxing nothing of his violence. *Cavalchini*, the Governor of Rome, who, it seems, was not properly submissive to the Emperor, was arrested and sent away to the fortress of *Fenestrelle;* Cardinal *Gabrielli*, Secretary of State, was surprised in the government office, and, after witnessing the breaking open of his desks and the seizure of his papers, was himself conducted to his episcopal see of *Sinigaglia;* and, some time later, Cardinal *Pacca*, who had been appointed pro-Secretary by the Pope, was also

[1] New Hist., etc, Bk. II., pp. 397 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, Bk. III., pp. 436 sq.

Hosted by Google

placed under arrest. Hearing of the arrest of his minister, the Pope at once sought him out, and going with him to the Quirinal palace, expressed his determination to share his captivity. The palace was forthwith surrounded by a military guard, and every one going in or coming out was strictly searched. A military court was set up to try and condemn such of the Pope's subjects as showed any reluctance to render obedience to the French authorities. Finally, on the 17th of May, 1809, the famous Vienna decree was published, annexing the remnant of the States of the Church to the French Empire,[1] and enacting that the Pope should receive a yearly revenue of two millions of francs, and retain his palaces and personal property, and declaring *Rome* a *free city of the Empire.* The decree was carried into execution on the following 10th of June, and the Pope at once caused a protest to be drawn up in the Italian language, which he signed, and had posted through the city on the night of the following day. With unbending dignity and steady adherence to duty he instructed Cardinal Pacca to take the necessary steps toward publishing a *bull of excommunication*, recommending, however, that the utmost prudence be used in carrying it into effect. In a few hours the celebrated bull *Quum memoranda illa die* was struck off, and on the following morning was found affixed to the doors of the three principal churches of Rome.[2] *Major excommunication and anathema* were pronounced against all the perpetrators, abettors, and advisers of the invasion of the rights and the territory of the Holy See; but at the same time the subjects of the Pope and all Christian peoples were forbidden to make this sentence a ground or pretext for invading either the rights or the property of those affected by it. Napoleon, while feigning to make a jest of the sentence of excommunication,[3] forbade the publication of the bull, which was received by all Christendom with expressions of undisguised satisfaction, and had an article inserted in the *Moniteur*, containing an exposition of the principles set forth in the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, denying the right of the Pope to pass sentence of excommunication upon any sovereign, and least of all upon the sovereign of France.[4] Pius VII., quietly but firmly refusing to abdicate his temporal sovereignty, was hurried away to Florence, thence to Turin, and from there to Grenoble, where orders were received to conduct him back through Dauphiné and Provence to *Savona*, where he arrived, worn out with the fatigue of a long journey on horseback through Piedmont.[5] At Valence Pius had the consolation of being able to bless the tomb of his predecessor. In

[1] New Hist., etc., Bk. III., pp. 482 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, Bk. III., p. 488. Also *Pacca's* Memoirs of His Holiness Pius VII., Bk. I., pp. 78 and 114 sq., where the text of the bull is given.

[3] In a letter to Eugene Beauharnais, Viceroy of Italy, he said: "Does he not know that the times are greatly changed? Does he mistake me for Louis the Mild? or does he think that his excommunications will cause the arms to drop from the hands of my soldiers?" (Mr. *A. Alison*, in his Hist. of Europe, quotes this passage, adding that Napoleon's words were literally fulfilled in the Russian campaign.—Tr.)

[4] See p. 498.

[5] Relation exacte et détaillée de l'enlèvement du Pape Pie VII. par Radet. Cf. New Hist., etc., p. 449; also *Pacca*, pp. 93 sq.

Hosted by Google

the meantime Cardinal Pacca had been separated from the Pope and led away to the stronghold of Fenestrelle, situated on one of the highest spurs of the Alps, between Piedmont and Dauphiné.[1]

At Savona the Holy Father was strictly guarded in the hôtel of the prefecture, not being allowed to hold audience with any one except in the presence of his guard. He steadily refused to accept his monthly allowance of a hundred thousand francs, declined to avail himself of the comforts and conveniences that had been provided for him, and set aside the pomp and circumstance with which it was intended to surround him, disdaining to be the recipient of any favor from the hand of a sacrilegious spoiler, and preferring to receive his support from the generosity and charity of the faithful. He repulsed with the same quiet energy and unbending dignity the frequently renewed demand to surrender his title to the government of Rome, and to go and reside as a pensioner of the French government at Paris, with an annuity of two millions of francs.[2]

On the day of the Pope's abduction, July 6, 1809, Napoleon gained the victory of Wagram, which secured to him the Peace of Vienna, October 13, 1809, and the hand of the archduchess, *Maria Louisa*. Now at the zenith of his power, he turned this coincidence to the best account, and, in a circular letter, addressed to all the bishops of France, ordered them to commemorate by a religious solemnity the day on which God seemed to have given a divine sanction to his attitude toward the Pope by giving so brilliant a victory to his arms. In justification of the measures adopted in relation to the Pope, he reminded the bishops that Christ, although of the royal house of David, had no desire to be an earthly prince; quite the contrary, for He instructed His followers to render obedience to Caesar and to Caesar's laws. In order to be able the better to influence the College of Cardinals as to the selection of a successor to Pius VII., in the event of his death, Napoleon, in December, 1809, ordered all the cardinals still residing in Rome to repair to Paris. He also had the archives of the various departments of ecclesiastical administration transported thither, thus suspending the regular labors of the various Congregations for an interval of five years.

Returning to Paris flushed with the victories of his Austrian campaign, Napoleon took the resolution of thrusting aside his lawful wife and contracting a second marriage, in the hope of leaving a lineal heir to the throne.[3] A decree

---

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. II., pp. 18–120. New Hist., etc., Bk. III., pp. 505 sq.

[2] Napoleon himself avowed that one of his favorite projects had been to take from the Pope his temporal power and to transfer him to Paris. Even when at St. Helena, he said: "The establishment of the Court of Rome at Paris would have been attended with important political results. The influence of the Pope over Spain, Italy, the Rhenish Confederation, and Poland would have strengthened the federative bonds of the Great Empire. The influence of the Head of Christendom over the Catholics of England, Ireland, Russia, Prussia, Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia, would have become the heritage of France." It is evident from these words why Napoleon came to an open rupture with the Pope.

[3] On the dissolution of Napoleon's marriage with Josephine, cf. *The Catholic*, of Mentz, Vol. 55, pp. 58 sq., where the alleged cause is said to have been the

Hosted by Google

of divorce was granted by a *senatûs consultum*, December 15, 1809, and was subsequently ratified by Cardinal Fesch, the Emperor's nephew, as Metropolitan of Paris, Archbishop of Lyons, and Primate of Gaul, acting on the pretext that access to the Holy Father was impracticable, if not impossible. Napoleon then demanded and received the hand of Maria Louisa of Austria, a daughter of the proud race of Hapsburg. The marriage was celebrated by proxy, March 11, 1810, and solemnly by Cardinal Fesch in the chapel of the Tuileries, April 2d of the same year. Thirteen of the cardinals refused to be present at the ceremony, and Napoleon in consequence ordered them in future to wear black instead of red, which gave rise to the well-known distinction between the *red cardinals* and the *black*. Some time later he banished the black cardinals to various provincial towns, and discontinued the payment of their revenues. It was about this time that Napoleon found the letter of Louis XIV. revoking the edict relative to the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy of 1682, which he pitched into the fire, with the remark, "These ashes will not give us much uneasiness hereafter."[1] Pius VII. showed himself quite as firm when a prisoner and in exile as when free and upon his throne; and now, as then, refused to confer canonical institution upon the bishops appointed by the Emperor, alleging that he did not wish to act without the advice of his cardinals, from which he was precluded by his captivity. To meet the difficulty and escape the danger which a persistent refusal might bring with it, it was suggested to the Pope to confer canonical institution, without mentioning either the fact that the bishops had been appointed by the Emperor or that he himself acted of his free will. This novel expedient and unworthy subterfuge was spurned by the Pope (August 26, 1809), as was also the proposition to commit the administration of dioceses to Vicars-Capitular, as had been done in Paris and Florence. The Emperor, transported with fury, determined to make the Pope feel the full weight of his anger. His books, papers, and even his writing materials were taken from him, and he received an intimation from the Prefect of *Montenotte* that any attempt to communicate with any church would subject both himself and the person addressed to the penalties of high treason and the church to confiscation. Not in the least intimidated, Pius VII. replied: "I shall lay these threats at the foot of the Crucifix, and give my cause, which is His also, into the keeping of God."

Fully conscious that his own dignity and the peace of his States required the immediate settlement of ecclesiastical affairs, which had been thrown into such disorder by his own violent acts, Napoleon appointed an Ecclesiastical Commission at Paris, November 16, 1810, to which he proposed the following questions:

---

non-observance of the formalities prescribed by the Council of Trent. See also *Kutschker*, Laws on Matrimony (Vol. IV., § 371), accompanied by the report of the *Abbé Rudemare*, then syndic of the ecclesiastical administration of Paris. Also Archives of Canon Law, by *Moy* and *Vehring*, Vol. III., p. 718; and particularly *Helfert* (Austrian Under-Secretary of State), Maria Louisa, Vienna, 1873.

[1] *De Pradt*, Histoire des quatre concordats, T. II., c. 31. *Pacca*, Vol. II., pp. 10 sq.

Hosted by Google

I. To whom should application be made for necessary dispensations when communication between the Pope and the subjects of the Emperor is entirely broken off?

II. Which is the best legal expedient for procuring the canonical institution of bishops appointed by the Emperor, when the Pope refuses to issue the necessary bulls?

The Commissioners, instead of pointing out to the Emperor that the only effectual way of putting an end to the disorders, growing out of the existing condition of things, lay in a restoration of the Pope to freedom and the enjoyment of his rights, drew a distinction between the general and the special laws of the Church. From the former, they said, there was no dispensation possible; from the latter, the bishops were competent to dispense, and to them the faithful might apply.

In reply to the second question, the Commissioners censured the conduct of the Pope, and recommended that a clause be added to the Concordat of 1801, binding the Holy See to confer canonical institution within a specified and limited time; and, in case of refusal, proposed that a National Synod be called, but not until after a deputation had waited upon the Pope and laid the true state of affairs before him.

The Emperor, having assembled the cardinals and bishops composing the Commission, the counselors of State, and the officers of the Crown, proceeded to make a violent harangue against the Pope. Of all those present, only the Abbé *Emery* had the manliness to tell the Emperor plainly that the council which he was about to convoke would have no authority whatever if it were not in unity with the Head of the Church and sanctioned by him. The Emperor, strange to say, did not seem offended by this outspoken frankness. He, nevertheless, issued a circular letter, written in that imperative tone and laconic style which he was wont to use toward his soldiers, and addressed to the French and Italian bishops, convoking a *National Council*, to meet at Paris, April 25, 1811. There were altogether ninety-five French and Italian prelates, of whom six were cardinals, nine archbishops, and eighty bishops. At the same time a deputation of bishops was sent to wait upon the Pope at Savona, to inform him that the Emperor desired to renew the Concordat of 1801, but on condition that the Holy See would confer canonical institution upon the bishops already appointed, and consent to the insertion of a clause to the following effect: "If the Pope shall not have issued the bull conferring canonical institution at the expiration of three months, the metropolitan may grant it to his suffragans, and reciprocally they to him." The Pope was further informed that upon these conditions he might return to Rome, after having taken the oath of obedience and allegiance to the Emperor, prescribed for bishops by the Concordat; that should he refuse these overtures he might reside at Avignon with an annuity of two millions of francs, where he would be treated as a sovereign, have the embassadors of all Christian powers at his court, and exercise his spiritual jurisdiction without restraint; but that he would not be permitted to take any steps hostile to the Four Articles of the Gallican Declaration. After the bishops had drawn a frightful picture of the evils that would follow his refusal, the Pope at length consented to confer canonical institution upon those appointed to bishopries by Napoleon; to extend the Concordat of 1801

Hosted by Google

to the churches of Tuscany, Parma, and Piacenza; and to accept the proposed clause, adding, however, that the term should be extended to six months, a condition which was agreed to by the Deputation, provided "that investiture was withheld for no reason other than the personal unworthiness of the candidate." Taking advantage of this momentary weakness, the bishops drew up four articles embodying the promises of the Pope, which the latter witnessed and agreed to, but declined to sign,[1] on the ground that the articles were neither a treaty nor a protocol, but simply an earnest of his desire to come to an understanding, which might lead to peace and harmony.

On the 17th of June of the same year the Council was opened at Paris by Cardinal Fesch with the customary ceremonies.[2] *Mgr. de Boulogne*, Bishop of Troyes, delivered a discourse on the importance of the Holy See and the influence of the Catholic religion on social order and the prosperity of nations. After the Mass of the Holy Ghost had been said, the symbol of Trent was read and the oath of *fidelity to the Pope* administered. Napoleon's message to the Council was singularly out of keeping with the oath. The debate on the address and the Emperor's message was spirited, lengthy, and marked by a wide divergence of opinion, which threatened to become serious. Some of the prelates demanded that, *before taking up any other business*, the Emperor be requested to set the Pope at liberty. The motion was drawn up and put before the Council by *Gaspar Maximilian, Baron of Droste-Vischering, suffragan bishop of Münster*,[3] and seconded by *Irenaeus de Solly*, Bishop of Chambéry, and by the Archbishop of Turin. It was opposed by the court-prelates on the ground that it would give offense to the Emperor. A lively opposition was made to these latter in the session of the 27th of June, when they proposed that in the address to the Emperor mention should be made of the Gallican Articles and canonical institution. The two sections having failed to agree, the address was signed by only the president and the secretary. A committee was appointed to carry the address to the Emperor on the 30th of June, but Napoleon was so incensed that he declined either to receive the committee or accept their address. After these preliminary skirmishes the Council took up the discussion of the question for which it was called together, and began to cast about for some means of dispensing with papal bulls in conferring canonical investiture on bishops. The preparatory committee, in a meeting at Cardinal Fesch's lodgings, at once decided by a majority of votes, that the Council could provide no substitute for pontifical bulls except provisionally, and then only in urgent cases. In the session of July 10th the Committee reported, giving the reasons for its decision. The bishops in the interests of the Emperor held and defended the contrary opinion, and in support of it appealed to the concessions made by the Pope at Savona; but being in the minority, they

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., p. 42 sq. New Hist., etc., Bk. III., p. 542 sq.

[2] † *Melchers*, The National Council of Paris in 1811, accompanied by authentic documents, Münster, 1814. *Robiano*, T. III., p. 172 sq. *Thiers*, Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, Vol. XIII., on which there is an elegant criticism in the *Correspondant*, livraison du 23 Juin, 1856.

[3] See *Gaspar Maximilian's* own declaration (in "*The Catholic*," 1825, Vol. XV., p. 325–355). *Lyonnet*, Le Cardinal Fesch, etc., Lyon, 1841.

Hosted by Google

were powerless, and their arguments were weakened by the fact that the promises wrung from the Pope were not authenticated by his signature. The Council was just preparing to solemnly avow its incompetency to deal with the question in hand, when its president suddenly prorogued its sessions; and Napoleon, learning what had taken place, signed a decree dissolving it altogether, July 18, 1811. Mgr. *de Boulogne*, Bishop of Troyes; Mgr. *Hirn*, Bishop of Tournay; Mgr. *de Broglie*, Bishop of Ghent, who as members of the Committee, had made themselves conspicuous by arguing against the competency of the Council, were arrested and imprisoned in the dungeons of Vincennes.

Seeing his projects frustrated, Napoleon cried out, while the first impulse of anger was still upon him: "I have been passing over an abyss unawares. That Concordat is the biggest blunder of my life." Before again convoking the Council, he determined to make sure of his men, and accordingly *Bigot de Préameneu* and *Bovara*, the ministers of worship for France and Italy, called personally upon each of the Bishops of these two countries then in Paris, and by promises and flatteries, by threats and reproaches, endeavored to gain them over to the interests of the Emperor. They were in a measure successful, having obtained the written promises of many of them and the conditional promises of others to support a contemplated decree; fourteen courageously refusing to sign the document at all. Having received the pledges of these prelates, the Emperor again ordered the bishops to assemble in general session, August 5th, when, on motion of M. Barral, a decree was passed, based upon the Savona concessions. A deputation of five cardinals and nine bishops, all of whom had given pledges before leaving Paris to support the designs of the government,[1] waited upon the Pope at Savona, and finally, on September 20th, obtained his signature to a brief drawn up by Cardinal *Roverella*, one of the deputies, approving the decree of the Conncil, on condition, however, that the metropolitan, in conferring canonical investiture, should state in every case that he did so *in the name of the Holy See*, to which all the documents properly authenticated should be sent. At the same time bulls were obtained conferring canonical institution upon a number of bishops. These transactions were telegraphed to Paris in a spirit of triumphant exultation, in which, however, Napoleon did not share. He sent back the brief, and refused to make any use of the bulls conferring investiture, very much to the disgust of the Abbé *de Pradt*, who, in drawing them up, had not forgotten his own archbishopric of Malines. Four of the bishops belonging to the Deputation having gone to Turin, received orders to return to Savona, and prevail upon the Pope to give a full consent to all the wishes of the Emperor. This the Pope firmly and steadfastly refused to do, and his resolution was not in the least shaken by the declaration of the Prefect of Montenotte, who, speaking in the name of the Emperor, said that since the brief of the 20th of September had not received the imperial sanction, Napoleon regarded the Concordat as revoked, and that in the future no papal interference in canonical investiture would be tolerated. The bishops assembled at Paris were now unceremoniously dismissed (October 20) by the Minister of Worship, and thus the Council that had been opened

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., pp. 52 sq.

Hosted by Google

with such pomp and splendor was closed without a religious solemnity of any kind.

After several months of anxious suspense, during which Napoleon was getting ready to set out on his Russian campaign, which was opened May 9, 1812, Pius VII. was summoned, June 9, 1812, to make preparations for a journey to France. He was instructed to lay aside every mark and token of his pontifical office, and to travel in the strictest incognito. After a very fatiguing journey, made for the most part during the heated hours of the day, the cortege arrived at the Convent of the Cistercians, on Mount Cenis, where the holy old man grew so ill that the officers, fearing to proceed, dispatched couriers to Turin to ask for fresh instructions. Word came back ordering them to do as they had been bidden, and on the 14th of June the Pope, who had that very morning received the last Sacraments, was once more hurried on his journey, traveling even during the night, and, without making a single halt, finally arrived at *Fontainebleau*, June 20th, where he fell so ill that his life was despaired of,[1] being unable to leave his bed for many months. The *red-cardinals* and some bishops high in the imperial favor, who alone were permitted to see him, attempted to frighten him by drawing highly colored pictures of the distressing condition of the Church, the dangers of an interminable schism, and the secret plots which the philosophical sects were actively prosecuting. Finding that such representations were ineffectual to move him, they appealed to his pity, begging him to call to mind the rigorous captivity in which many cardinals and bishops were now languishing. Their efforts were unavailing, and in the meantime Napoleon having returned from his disastrous Russian campaign, and dreading a revolution of feeling among Frenchmen still sincerely devoted to the Catholic Church, hastened, with either real or simulated sincerity, to be again reconciled to the Pope. On New Year's Day, 1813, he sent one of his chamberlains to carry his good wishes to Pius VII., who returned the compliment through Cardinal *Doria*, during whose visit at Paris it was agreed that negotiations should again be opened between the Pope and the Emperor. When those charged with conducting them perceived that the Holy Father was broken in spirit and disposed to yield, they were desirous that the Emperor should have all the glory of again establishing friendly relations between France and the Holy See. Accordingly the Emperor, accompanied by the Empress, made his appearance very unexpectedly at Fontainebleau, where he spent five days in conference with Pius VII. All the arts of persuasion were used to bring the Pope to terms. The Emperor was by turns gentle and caressing, severe and cold, imperious and threatening. At one time he so far lost control of his temper, and so far forgot the respect due to the Head of the Church, as to reproach him "*with being ill-informed in ecclesiastical matters.*"[2]

These negotiations were finally brought to a close on the 25th of January, when eleven *articles preliminary* to a new Concordat were signed. By these unfortunate articles the Pope pledged himself to confer canonical institution

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., pp. 60 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. III., pp. 66 sq. New Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. III., pp. 593 sq.

Hosted by Google

upon bishops appointed by the Emperor within six months, at the expiration of which time it might be conferred by the metropolitan, or, he failing, by the senior suffragan of the province. In return the Pope was permitted to appoint to ten sees in either France or Italy, and also to the six suburbicarian bishoprics, which, it was provided, were to be re-established; the endowments not already disposed of were to be restored, and such as had been sold repurchased; the domains of the Holy See not as yet alienated were to be administered by the Pope's mandatary, and an annuity of two millions of francs granted as an indemnification for those that had been alienated; the number of bishoprics in Tuscany and the territory of Genoa was to be reduced, and new ones established in Holland and the Hanseatic Departments; and, finally, all persons, whether cardinals, bishops, or laymen, who had in the course of the late events incurred the Emperor's displeasure were to be rehabilitated.

By signing these articles, had he done so unconditionally, Pius VII. would have virtually renounced his right of sovereignty within the States of the Church. This, however, he did not do; for he explicitly stipulated that they should not be promulgated until after they had been singly discussed in a secret Consistory, as the laws of the Church require. But Napoleon, instead of waiting the result of such discussion, styled these articles, which were understood as being only preliminary measures, the *Concordat of Fontainebleau*, and at once gave orders that they should be promulgated throughout the whole Empire, and that the *Te Deum* should be chanted in all the churches.

Immediately after the departure of the Emperor, the Pope lapsed into a state of profound melancholy. To Cardinal *di Pietro*, who was the first of the cardinals to obtain his freedom, the Pope spoke out his mind. The cardinal drew his attention to the fact that a Concordat concluded upon such a basis might bring disastrous consequences upon the Church. Cardinal *Pacca* and several other members of the Sacred College, who arrived soon after, were of the same opinion, and resolved to request the Pope to address a letter to the Emperor, revoking the Preliminary Articles, and declaring them null and void.

When Cardinal *Consalvi* informed the Holy Father of the action of the cardinals, he freely admitted that he had been led to consent to what he now clearly saw was wholly impracticable, and accordingly approved the plan of proceeding advised by the Sacred College. To sit down and sketch the rough draft of this ever memorable letter, and to write it out with his own hand and address it to the Emperor, must have cost Pius VII. a painful struggle.[1] He *had it read before the Sacred College*, and as the reading was going on made such reflections on its contents as it was not thought prudent to set down in writing. A copy of the letter was given to each of the cardinals.

Learning that the Pope, since his interview with Cardinal *di Pietro*, had determined to revoke the Preliminary Articles, Napoleon at once promulgated the Concordat as a law of the Empire; and, immediately upon receipt of the Holy Father's letter, published a decree threatening severe penalties against all persons infringing the Concordat, and making it obligatory upon all archbishops, bishops, and chapters within his dominions. On the 13th of April, Cardinal di Pietro was placed under arrest, stripped of the insignia of his dignity,

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., pp. 83–90, and pp. 91–107 to the cardinals.

Hosted by Google

and carried away a prisoner to Auxonne. Cardinals Pacca and Consalvi were charged to say to the Pope that the cause of Cardinal di Pietro's punishment was his flagrant hostility to the State. In a letter addressed by the Pope to the cardinals, dated May 9th, the induction granted by metropolitans was declared to be of no effect; the bishops who had received it were designated as intruders; and the consecrating bishops pronounced schismatics. After the disasters of the year 1813, the Emperor saw more clearly than ever the necessity of coming to an understanding with the Holy See. Hence he now proposed to allow the Pope to return to Rome and to restore to him all the States of the Church that had not been included in the last imperial decree. Pius VII. replied, January 21, 1814, refusing to take back the Patrimony of St. Peter unless it were restored in all its integrity.[1] He then received orders to set out for Savona at once, but before doing so addressed a last and touching allocution to the cardinals, and left whatever instructions he desired to give them with Cardinal *Mattei*, the Dean of the College.[2] Not one of the Cardinals was allowed to accompany the Pope, who, while passing through France, was everywhere hailed with the most tender demonstrations of respect. He again entered Savona on the 11th of February, 1814. The cardinals were sent off to the various cities of the Empire, each accompanied by a guard. After the whole of Italy had been lost, and when the half of France was in possession of the allied forces, Napoleon restored the departments of Rome and Trasimene to the Holy See (March 18th), and sent a courier to Savona with orders to have the Pope set at liberty. On the 25th of March the Holy Father arrived on the banks of the Tarno, where he was surrendered to the allied forces. He arrived at Bologna on the 31st of March, the very day that the allied armies made their triumphant entry into Paris. All those who had been imprisoned for religion's sake were at once set free. Cardinal *Consalvi*[3] rejoined the Pope at Cesena, and was again appointed Secretary of State. Finally, after having undergone so many and so great trials and hardships, Pius VII. made his entrance into Rome May 24, 1814, amid the joyous acclamations and splendid festivities of the whole people. In the following year the Congress of Vienna restored to him the Marches and Legations which had been wrested from his predecessor by the Treaty of *Tolentino*.

§ 392. *The Sad Condition of the Church in Germany, Italy, and Spain.*

At the very moment when the dawn of a brighter day was opening upon the Church of France a violent storm broke over that of *Germany*.[4] The statesmen to whom the grave

[1] *Pacca*, Vol. III., p. 133. While negotiations were in progress, the Pope said: "Possibly my sins make me unworthy to again see Rome; but be assured that my successors will recover all the States belonging to them."

[2] *Pacca*, Vol. III., pp. 137–139. New Hist., etc., Bk. III., pp. 623 sq.

[3] *Cenni*, Life of Card. Consalvi, Venice, 1824.

[4] *Pacca*, "Memorie storiche," on his sojourn in Germany, from 1786–1794,

Hosted by Google

political problems of that country were committed seemed to have no object in view other than to make good the losses sustained by the hereditary princes from the possessions of the Church. Hence, in accordance with the Treaty of *Lunéville* (1801) and the *resolutions of the Deputation of the Empire at Ratisbon* (1803), it was decided that the principalities and possessions of the Church should be in part made over to France and in part *secularized*, to make good to civil princes their territorial losses on the left bank of the Rhine. In the Treaty of the Peace of Westphalia the principle had been laid down that secular princes should receive indemnification from the Church for territorial losses.[1] By the thirty-fifth paragraph of the resolutions adopted by the Deputation of the Empire at Ratisbon, princes were empowered *to take complete possession* of "all property belonging to the foundations, abbeys, and monasteries within their States," and to dispose of it at their discretion, "in providing for public worship and instruction, in founding useful institutions, and *in restoring their own finances*." These decrees were carried out in a spirit which only an iniquitous cupidity and the basest passions of man could inspire. The treasures, the jewels, the relics, and whatever else of value was to be found in the churches were seized, sold, and scattered.[2] It was argued that the property of ecclesiastical princes, of abbeys, and of chapters should be

Roma, 1832; Germ., Augsburg, 1832. New Hist., Bk. II., p. 205–222; Bk. III., p. 568. *Robiano*, T. III., p. 58 sq. *G. V. Schmid*, The Secularized Bishoprics of Germany, Gotha, 1858, with the device, taken from *Lucretius:* "Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!" **Gams*, Vol. I., p. 304 sq. *Harl*, New Changes in the States and the Church of Germany, Berlin, 1804. *Thiers*, Histoire du consulat et de l'empire, T. IV., liv. XV. (sécularisation). **Buss* (Documentary), History of National and Territorial Churches, Schaffhausen, 1851, p. 776. *Starck*, in the *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. X., p. 345; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, p. 381.

[1] It is there significantly said that "*Ecclesiastical possessions are the cloth from which equivalents are to be cut.*" Cf. *Schwab*, Francis Berg, Prof. of Ch. Hist. at Würzburg, pp. 321 sq.

[2] There are some curious disclosures concerning the monasteries situated in the present Grand-Duchy of Baden, in the work entitled "State of Affairs in Baden," Ratisbon, 1841–1843, 2 pts.; and concerning those of Würtemberg and Bavaria in *Gams*, Hist. of the Church of Christ in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., pp. 304 sq.

Hosted by Google

no less sacred than that of secular princes, and that the sacrifices necessary to indemnify the latter should in common justice be equally borne by all the estates of the Empire. No attention was paid to these representations. Such was the cause of the extinction in Germany of the three ecclesiastical electorates of *Mentz*, *Cologne*, and *Treves;* of the seizure of the territorial possessions of sees directly subject to the Empire, like the archbishopric of Salzburg and the bishopric of Liége, Passau, Trent, Brixen, Constance, Bamberg, Freisingen, Eichstaedt, Würzburg, Münster, Hildesheim, Paderborn, and Osnabrück; and finally of the alienation of the lands of a considerable number of abbeys and convents.[1] As

[1] According to the account left by *Klüber*, compiled from the diplomatic transactions of the Congress of Vienna, Part II., p. 404, the losses sustained by the Catholic Church on both banks of the Rhine amounted to 1,710 German, or 36,346 English square miles, representing a population of 3,162,576 and a yearly revenue of 21,026,000 florins, or $8,410,400, without including the monastic establishments. In Pt. III., p. 399, the *same author* says: "It is not as generally known as it should be how all these questions of indemnity were disposed of in the Congress of Rastadt, and particularly at Paris and Ratisbon in the years 1802 and 1803; what schemes were laid; what various interests came into play on the battle-field of diplomacy, once it became known that the temporal power had entered upon the work of disposing of ecclesiastical property. Time alone will lift the veil." Cf., also, *Menzel*, New Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. II., pp. 307 sq. The amount of indemnity obtained by certain princes is certainly remarkable. For example: *Prussia*, for a loss of 48 German (= 1,020 English) square miles, containing a population of 127,000, and yielding a yearly revenue of 1,400,000 florins, received, in the bishopric of Hildesheim, Paderborn, and Münster, in the territory of Eichsfeld, and in the abbeys of Herford, Elten, Essen, Verden, and Cappenberg, an extent of territory equal to 235½ German (= 5,005 English) square miles, containing a population of 559,000, and yielding a yearly revenue of 3,800,000 florins. Again, *Bavaria* (and the Palatinate on the Rhine), for 255 German (= 5,420 Eng.) sq. miles, with 800,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 5,000,000 of florins, received 290 Germ. (= 6,162 Eng.) sq. miles, with 800,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 6,000,000 of florins; *Würtemberg*, for 7 Germ. (= 170 Eng.) sq. miles, with 14,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 336,000 florins, received 29 Germ. (= 616 Eng.) sq. miles, with 110,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 700,000 florins; *Baden*, for 8 Germ. (= 170 Eng.) sq. miles, with 25,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 250,000 florins, received 59¾ Germ. (= 1,260 Eng.) sq. miles, with 237,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 1,540,000 florins; *Hesse-Darmstadt*, for 13 Germ. (= 276 Eng.) sq. miles, with 46,000 inhabitants and a revenue of 390,000 florins, received 95½ Germ. (= 2,021½ Eng.) sq. miles, with 124,500 inhabitants and a revenue of 753,000 florins; *Hesse-Cassel*, for ¾ of a Germ (= 16 Eng.) sq. miles, with 2,300

Hosted by Google

most of these territories passed out of the hands of their Catholic rulers and under the dominion of Protestant princes or governments, conducted on the principles of the eighteenth century or on the Napoleonic policy, the Catholic Church had neither recognized rights, defenders, nor protection of any sort. After Franconia had passed under the power of Bavaria, a Protestant faculty of theology was established at the University of Würzburg by the advice of the all-powerful minister, *Montgelas*, and the Socinian *Paulus*, surnamed "*the wortnest theologian of Germany*," called to preside over it (1803). As there were no Protestant students of divinity, Catholic seminarists and students intending to read theology were for some time forced to attend the lectures of Dr. Paulus. The Prince-Bishop protested, but to no purpose.[1]

The adroit and versatile Archchancellor, *Theodore Baron von Dalberg*, prevented the sacrifice of his eminent ecclesiastical position by transferring his metropolitan rights from Mentz to *Ratisbon* (February 1, 1803); creating a principality for himself out of Aschaffenburg, Ratisbon, Wetzlar, the House of Compostella at Frankfort, and the customs of the right bank of the Rhine; and extending his spiritual jurisdiction as *Primate of Germany* over a portion of the former ecclesiastical provinces of Mentz, Cologne, and that part of Treves situated on the right bank of the Rhine, with the exception, however, of the States belonging to the King of Prussia, and as much of Salzburg as had been surrendered to Bavaria. If the Chancellor Dalberg owed both the preservation and increase of his dignity to the influence of Napoleon, it can not be said that he was ungrateful, for, by his own personal authority, and without consulting either Pope or chapter, he appointed *Cardinal Fesch*, the Emperor's uncle, his coadjutor. After the battle of Leipsig, and the overthrow of Napoleon's power in Germany, Dalberg renounced both his rights and his possessions as prince,[2] and contented himself with the Archbishopric of Ratisbon. He died February 10, 1817. In passing the decree of *secularization*, it was provided that the chapters that had been preserved should enjoy a fixed revenue, and monks and ecclesiastics receive a yearly pension. These allowances were small and ill paid, and as to the churches no provision at all had been made for securing them a steady income. Again, by the death and dispersion of many of the canons, the bishops were in some sort left without chapters; they had not even the necessaries of life; and consequently, after the death of some and

inhabitants and a revenue of 30,000 florins, received 4½ Germ. (= 95 Eng.) sq. miles, with a population of 13,000 and a revenue of 60,000 florins, with an electorate thrown in.

[1] *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 472–509; *Menzel*, Mod. Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. II., pp. 344 sq.

[2] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. III., pp. 3–9; Fr. trans., Vol. 6, pp. 4 sq.

Hosted by Google

the resignation of others, nearly all the sees of Germany became vacant. *Dalberg*, as Primate of Germany, and wielding a powerful influence, might have materially aided *della Genga*, the Papal Nuncio, who was sent to Germany, in 1803, to re-establish the imprescriptible rights of the Church; but being imbued with the liberal principles of the age, he showed no disposition to do so. *Clement Wenceslaus*, formerly Prince-Elector of Treves, pleaded powerfully for the claims of the Church, but to no purpose.[1] To provide for the government of the dioceses that had fallen vacant, the Pope was obliged to appoint either *Vicars Apostolic* or *Vicars General*, who not unfrequently were either lacking in energy, ignorant of the localities, or mistrusted by their diocesans. Such as were possessed of qualifications fitting them to rule with advantage over their churches, found the exercise of their functions and their communication with the Holy See impeded by innumerable obstacles. The hand of the government was everywhere visible; even the sanctuary was not sacred against its presence. The police were constantly about the churches, giving all sorts of petty annoyances; prescribing the formularies of prayer to be used; supervising the recitation of the breviary, the administration of the Sacraments, and the celebration of Mass; and giving instructions with regard to such trifling matters as wax-candles and incense. The king, without asking the authorization of the Pope, established a new cathedral-chapter at *Breslau*, June 8, 1812, but the canons were soon made to feel that they were out of place.[2]

It need excite no surprise, then, that religious feeling, which had long since grown cold in Germany, should have become well-nigh extinct toward the close of the eighteenth century. However, amid a decline so deep and wide-spread, there were to be found shining examples of virtue and holiness. *Francis of Fürstenberg*[3] governed the diocese of Münster with wisdom, and in his own person illustrated a life of sanctity. Gathered about him were such men as *Overberg*, *Gaspar Maximilian*, and *Clement August von Droste*, whose lives were a perpetual argument in favor of the Catholic faith, and who, by word and example, drew others to embrace its teachings. Among these were such high and holy souls as the princess *Gallitzin*, Count *Stolberg*, *Hemsterhuys*, and *Hamann*. The *theological*

[1] *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 379 sq.

[2] *Ritter*, Manual of Ch. Hist., 5th ed., Vol. II., pp. 538–542.

[3] *Esser*, Francis of Fürstenberg, His Life, His Works, Münster, 1842. *Krabbe*, Historical Account of the Higher Institutions of Learning at Münster, *Ibid.* 1852. *Katerkamp*, Memorabilia from the Life of Princess Gallitzin, Münster, 1828. *Nicolovius*, Fred. Leop., Count of Stolberg, Mentz, 1846. *Carvachi*, Biographical Reminiscenses of Hamann, Münster, 1855. *Menzel*, Modern Hist. of the Germans, Vol. XII., Pt. I. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. XII., p. 434 sq., 637 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 9, pp. 232, 248 sq.; Vol. 13, p. 5.

Hosted by Google

school of the Grand Seminary of Mentz, founded by the distinguished German bishop and pulpit-orator *Colmar* (1802–1818) exercised a very beneficial influence; counteracted in a measure the liberalistic tendencies of the Protestant University of the same city; and furnished at least one spot where sound doctrine might find a refuge and a home.

Italy and *Spain* being under the dominion of France, were subjected to the same disastrous changes in ecclesiastical affairs that took place in that country. Monasteries and congregations were suppressed, and the property of the Church confiscated; encroachments were daily made upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and ecclesiastical administration was constantly interfered with; and, finally, under color of a sanction, forcibly extorted from the Pope, the number of bishoprics was diminished. For example, in *Piedmont*, Cardinal *Caprara*, by a bull dated July 1, 1803, reduced the number of bishoprics from seventeen to eight; and in the States of the Church seventeen sees were suppressed. The Concordat entered into with the Italian Republic, September 16, 1803, was more favorable to the Church than that with France, for the bishops were permitted to keep up communications with the Holy See.[1] But by a decree issued in February, 1804, by Vice-President *Melzi*, the privileges heretofore enjoyed were in a large measure withdrawn; and while the widest interpretation was given to clauses favorable to the government, those recognizing the lawful authority of the Church were narrowly restricted.

Affairs in *Spain* were in no better condition than in Italy.[2] First of all, the monasteries were reduced to one-third of their original number; and, as a punishment for the disloyalty of the clergy who took part in the Spanish insurrection some time later, *Joseph Bonaparte* suppressed all the convents of Regulars and Mendicants, including those of the Third Order or Tertiaries, and confiscated their property, allowing to each of the ejected religious a trifling sum for his support. The bishops and chapters were requested to draw up public ad-

[1] New Hist. of the Christian Church, Bk. II., pp. 261 sq.; Bk. III, pp. 574 sq.
[2] New Hist. etc., Bk. III., pp. 462 sq., pp. 750 sq.

Hosted by Google

dresses, declaring their adhesion to the principles of the Gallican Church. Of those who were weak enough to consent, the greater number were French bishops, who had been appointed by Napoleon to Spanish and Italian sees, the addresses ascribed to the others being mostly supposititious.

At this time the prisons of Italy were filled with cardinals, bishops, and prelates, whose only crime was loyalty to the principles of the Catholic Church; who, during their confinement, were subjected to treatment as harsh and cruel[1] as that to which their persecutor some time later himself fell a victim, when hurled from the proudest throne in the world, the once powerful monarch, who had held in his hands the destinies of Europe, went to expiate both his faults and his glory on a desolate island in the middle of the ocean. While there the soul of this great genius, so long dazzled by prosperous fortune, was illuminated by the pure rays of the light of faith, and was once more drawn to the religion which, during the last years of his reign, he had so bitterly persecuted.[2]

§ 393. *The Restoration.*

The horrors of the Revolution, and the sufferings and long and bloody wars that followed it, revived a religious feeling in the hearts of men, and led them to appreciate and desire the blessings of religion. The claims of faith were again recognized, religion once more resumed its sway over men's souls, false philosophy for a time lost ground, Christianity was victorious, and the Church triumphant. With the Church there is no middle course, no half measures. Any one falling against this rock shall be crushed. This lesson was taught by the Revolution, and learned by the Revolutionists, but at a great cost. Those who had restored order, though loving revolution, dreaded its consequences, and were alarmed at the danger of again precipitating the country into another such

[1] *Pacca*, Memoirs of the Life of Pius VII., Vol. II., pp. 68 sq.

[2] Cfr. Sentiment de Napoléon sur la divinité de Jésus Christ; pensées inédites recueillies à Sainte-Hélène par M. le comte *de Montholon* et publiées par M. le chevalier *de Beauterne*, 2d ed., Paris, 1842. *Holzwarth*, Napoleon I.

Hosted by Google

abyss. They resolved to pursue a safe course.[1] Rulers recognizing the fact that religion is the firmest support of government, and that the two stand or fall together, began to look with favor upon the Church, which they had so long disowned, renounced, and persecuted.

On the 26th of September, 1815, the three sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, then at Paris, entered into a compact known as the *Holy Alliance*, the object of which was, putting out of sight the distinctive teachings of the various churches, to re-establish the public law of nations and political life upon the general principles of Christianity.[2] This compact, entered into while their minds were filled with the enthusiasm inspired by a victory gained with such difficulty and at so many sacrifices, contained within itself the germs of dissolution and discord. Little by little its binding power relaxed, and in 1840 three Christian monarchs were embarked in the incongruous enterprise of reconquering the Holy Land for the Turks.[3] An undertaking at once more worthy in itself and more in harmony with the principles that were supposed to have inspired the framers of the Holy Alliance, was the repression of the slave-trade on the coast of Africa, and the extinction of this barbarous traffic, so contrary to every Christian instinct and teaching, by the treaties of 1818 and 1841, made by England, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia.

Still the enemies of the Church by no means considered themselves vanquished, and the conflict between *revolutionary principles* and the teachings of religion went on as furiously as ever, and not unfrequently occasioned the abridgment of the rights of the Church and the privileges of Religious Orders.

---

[1] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 45, year 1860.

[2] Cf. New Hist. of the Christian Church, Vol. IV., pp. 699 sq. Pope Pius VII. declined to join it, because, as he said, "a line of action, such as contemplated by the Holy Alliance, was within the *Church's own calling*."

[3] Cf. "The Holy Land and European Christendom," in the "Eccl. Gazette of South Germany," year 1841, nros. 1 and 3.

Hosted by Google

§ 394. *Rehabilitation of the Pope — Re-establishment of the Jesuits.*

Pius VII. made his solemn entry into Rome May 24, 1814, amid the joyful acclamations of the people, but was again driven from the city, after the escape of Napoleon from Elba (February 26, 1815), by the advance of his brother-in-law, Murat, who, having ambitious designs on the whole of Italy, entered the States of the Church at the head of his army. The Pope withdrew to Genoa,[1] where he received fresh proofs of the devoted attachment of the people of Italy. After the "Hundred Days" and Napoleon's complete overthrow in the disaster of Waterloo, the Pope once more returned to take peaceable possession of his faithful city, never again to leave it. Cardinal *Consalvi* was sent to the *Congress of Vienna*, to protest in the name of the Pope against whatever had been done hostile to the interests of the Holy See and the Universal Church, and in particular against the cession of the districts situated on the Po, the occupation of Ferrara by the Austrians, the loss of Avignon and the county of Venaissin, and the secularization and dissolution of the German Empire. To the amazement of all Europe, Pius VII., who had been educated by the enemies of the Jesuits, re-established the Society of Jesus by the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, of August 7, 1814, the execution of which he intrusted to Cardinal *Pacca*, who in his younger days had been a great admirer of the *Lettres Provinciales*.

This act of tardy justice was practically a denial of the charges brought against the Jesuits at the time of their suppression.[2] The cardinal has left us a vivid picture of the impression which their re-establishment produced upon the minds of all.[3] According to the Pope's own statement, he acted on the demand of all Catholic Christendom. Attempts had already been made to revive the Society under other names. In 1794 an association was founded for this purpose by the Fathers *de Broglie* and *de Tournely*, former members of the

[1] *Pacca*, Journey of Pope Pius VII. to Genoa in the Spring of 1815, and his Return to Rome; Germ. trans., Augsburg, 1834.

[2] *Robiano*, Vol. II., p. 494–538. Cf. New Hist., Bk. IV., p. 661.

[3] *Pacca*, Memoirs of Pius VII.; Vol. III., p. 117 sq. *Dallas-Kerz*, The Jesuit Order, p. 300 sq. *Buss*, The Society of Jesus, pp. 1334 sq.

Hosted by Google

Society, under the name of the *Society of the S. Heart;* and in 1798 another by *Pancanari*, known as the *Society of the Faith of Jesus*, the members themselves being designated as the *Fathers of the Faith* (*Pères de la foi*). These latter formed the nucleus for the new Society in France. At the very opening of the pontificate of Pius VII., there were signs justifying the belief that the Society would be soon re-established. As early as 1804, the Pope, at the solicitation of Ferdinand I., authorized its introduction into the kingdom of the *Two Sicilies* by the bull *Per alios*, issued July 31 of this year. Except in the *States of the Church*, none of their property was restored to the Jesuits. Elsewhere they were the objects of the same hatred, suspicion, and calumny that their predecessors had endured, and which has been their heritage in every age and country. They were received in *Naples*, in *Belgium*, and in *Ireland;* the instruction of youth was committed to them in *Sardinia;* in *France* they were permitted to exist undisturbed until the year 1828; in *England* they founded colleges at *Stonyhurst*, *Hodderhouse*, and other places;[1] and in *Spain* they were put in possession of their former rights and property by Ferdinand VII., after his own restoration, in 1814. They were banished from Spain during the revolution of 1820, but returned with the restoration in 1823. The Society was again suppressed in the Spanish dominions in 1835, and again re-established in 1844. They were once more expelled the kingdom by Espartero in 1854, and recalled by O'Donnell in 1858. They were finally driven out of the Spanish peninsula entirely after the revolution of 1868, and permitted to exist by sufferance only in the colonies. They were set over a college in Modena in 1815; recalled to Switzerland and put in possession of their property by the government of the Canton of *Valais* in 1814; they reopened their college at *Fribourg* in September, 1818, which soon became one of the most celebrated of the Society's; were invited in 1844 by the Grand Council of *Lucerne* to take chairs in the theological school of that capital; and, when prosecuted, some time later, seven Catholic Cantons formed an alliance for their protection, but in November, 1847, they fell with the *Sonderbund.* Finally, they founded several colleges in the *United States* and the *Canadas*, where they have always enjoyed the most complete freedom. John Carroll, a professed Father, and some of his countrymen, who were completing their "third probation" in the Austrian dominions when the bull of suppression was issued, hastened to the United States, and continued to live in community until the Society was re-established. From that time forward their growth has been rapid, and they have now two provinces, one of Baltimore and the other of Missouri. Besides the philosophical and theological seminary and house of studies for their own

[1] The colleges at present conducted by them in England are Stonyhurst, near Whalley, in Lancashire; Mt. St. Mary's, near Chesterfield; and Beaumont Lodge, near Windsor. They have also the Scholasticate of St. Benno's, at St. Asaph. Besides these educational establishments, they have many flourishing religious houses in England and Scotland, and some missions in Guiana and Jamaica. In *Ireland* they conduct, besides the well-known College of *Clongowes*, others at Tullabeg, Dublin, Limerick, and Galway. They have also a noviciate at Milton Park, Donnybrook. Attached to the Irish province are also missionary establishments in Melbourne, Australia. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

scholastics at *Woodstock*, Maryland, they have *eighteen colleges* situated in the most considerable cities of the Union.[1]

They were invited by the *Austrian* government to establish themselves in *Galicia* in 1820, and permitted to open a college at *Tarnopol*. After the revolution of 1848 had passed away, their numbers and establishments rapidly increased. Seven State colleges, one chair in the Theological Faculty of Vienna, and the entire Theological Faculty of the University of Innsbruck were handed over to them by the government. Their existence in Austria at present is precarious. In *Russia* their college at *Polotzk* was raised in 1812 to the rank of a university, but owing to the conversion of several young noblemen, who had been educated by them, they fell under the displeasure of the Tzar, and by an imperial ukase of January 1, 1816 (December 20, 1815), their establishments in St. Petersburg and Moscow were closed; and, by another of March 25, 1820, the Society was suppressed in all the Russias and Poland.

The Pope restored several other monastic Orders. The *Academy of the Catholic Religion* (*Accademia di Religion Cattolica*), founded in 1800 by Mgr. Coppola, Archbishop of Myra, and revived in 1803 by Mgr. *Zamboni*, now received papal approbation. The *foreign colleges at Rome* were again reopened by Pius VII., the *German* September 8, 1817, the *English* and *Scotch* in 1818; and also the *College of the Propaganda*, to whose subsequent prosperity Cardinal *Pedicini* largely contributed. Of its once splendid library, there remained at this time only its most ancient and most valuable Oriental manuscripts. Continuing the work of restoration,

[1] These are: Boston College, South Boston; College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.; St. Francis Xavier's, New York; St. John's, New York (Fordham); St. Joseph's, Philadelphia; St. John's, Frederick, Md.; Loyola, Baltimore; Gonzaga, Washington, D. C.; Georgetown, D. C.; Spring Hill, near Mobile, Ala.; St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.; College of the Immaculate Conception, New Orleans; St. Charles', Grand Coteau, La.; St. Xavier's, Cincinnati; St. Ignatius' College, San Francisco; Santa Clara, Cal.; St. Mary's, Kan.; Jersey City, N. J.; Detroit, Mich.; Troy, N. Y.; Las Vegas, N. M.; Pueblo, Col., opened in 1877; and Omaha, Neb. (*Creighton Fund*), accepted in 1878.

Hosted by Google

the Pope established several new chairs in the Roman University, and, by special treaties, entered into with France, Sardinia, and Bavaria (1817), Naples (1818), Prussia (1821), and other States, again, to his great joy, put the Church in these countries on a permanent footing. But with these consolations, which so gladdened the heart of the Father of Christendom, was mingled a feeling of poignant grief, occasioned by the stern necessity he was under of condemning the *Carbonari*, who, under the mask of patriotism and religion, were again fanning the dying embers of revolution into a fresh flame (September 13, 1821).[1]

On the other hand, the august and noble Pontiff, acting upon the inspiration of high and generous Christian sentiments, furnished an honorable asylum in Rome to Madame Laetitia, Napoleon's mother, and to the other members of the imperial family, who were persecuted by every other government, and repelled from every other country. In July, 1823, Pius VII. accidentally fell and broke his thigh, and in consequence of the inflammation that set in, sunk gradually and died on the 20th of August following, having reached the patriarchal age of eighty-two years.[2]

Neither captivity, exile, threats, nor any other sort of ill-treatment could break the spirit of this intrepid old man, who, down to the last day of his long life, defended the rights of the Church with unshaken fortitude and dauntless courage. When every sovereign of Europe was bowing down before the scepter of Napoleon, the Successor of St. Peter, and he alone, resisted the conqueror, and manfully maintained his rights. And when the proud conqueror had fallen, and was expiating his crimes and his ambition on the island of St.

[1] New Hist. of the Christian Church, Bk. IV., p. 777.

[2] The reign of Pius VII. began March 21, 1800, and ended August 20, 1823, lasting twenty-three years and five months. That of his predecessor, Pius VI., began February 15, 1775, and ended August 29, 1799, lasting about twenty-four years and six months. The statement of Abbé *Darras* (Ch. Hist., Vol. IV., p. 578) that Pius VII. reigned longer than any Pope since St. Peter is therefore incorrect, as is also the statement (Ibid., p. 547) that Pius VII. died September 29, or, as he says on page 578, on September 20. *Artaud*, the Pope's biographer, who was at his bedside, says (Vol. II., p. 605) that he died at five o'clock on the morning of August 20. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Helena, the Pope, whom he had persecuted so long and so cruelly, was again alone among all the crowned heads of Europe to ask from the Cabinet of St. James some mitigation of his hard lot.

§ 395. *Reorganization of the Catholic Church in Sardinia and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.*

Desirous of seeing religion once more flourishing in his States, which, owing to the frequent change of government since the breaking out of the French Revolution, had been deeply agitated, *Victor Emmanuel*, King of Sardinia, sent Count Barbaroux to Rome in 1817 to conclude a Concordat, according to the articles of which a new division of the dioceses was made, the number increased to nineteen, and those of Turin, Vercelli, and Genoa raised to the rank of archbishoprics.

In consequence of the vicissitudes through which his kingdom of the Two Sicilies had also passed since the opening of the century, King *Ferdinand* likewise concluded a Concordat of thirty-six articles with the Holy See, which, embodying nearly the whole of ecclesiastical legislation, provided that the Catholic religion should be the religion of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; that the bishoprics on this side of the Straits of Messina should be consolidated, and the number of those on the other side increased;[1] that appointments to abbacies and canonries of free collation in cathedral and collegiate chapters should belong to the Pope during the first six months of the year, and during the next six months to the bishops; that all ecclesiastical property not yet alienated should be restored to the Church, but that ample guarantees of indemnity should be given to the present holders of the alienated estates; that the Church should have the right of acquiring new property in real estate; that certain restrictions on the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction should be removed; that both clergy and laity should enjoy the fullest freedom of communication with the Holy See in all ecclesiastical af-

[1] New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., pp. 755–760; and *Gams*, Vol. II., pp. 605 sq. and 668 sq.

Hosted by Google

fairs; and, finally, that the king and his successors should have the right of nominating to sees falling vacant.

§ 396. *The Catholic Church in Germany.* (See § 392.)

* *Organon*, or Brief Information on the Ecclesiastical Organization of the Catholics in Germany, Augsburg, 1830. *Onymus*, The Situation of the Catholic Church in Germany, Würzburg, 1818. *R.....s*, Supplements to the Latest History of the Constitution of the Catholic Church in Germany, Strasburg, 1830. The Concordats all printed off in *Phillips'* C. L., Vol. III., and that of *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., p. 214 sq. *Plank*, Reflections on the Latest Changes in the Situation of the Cath. Church in Germany, Hanover, 1808. Cf. New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., p. 674–677. *Bülau*, Hist. of Germany from 1806–1830, Hamburg, 1842. *Wolfgang Menzel*, The Six Scores of Years from 1740–1860, Vol. III.

The Deputation of the Empire, holding its sessions at Ratisbon, declared on the 25th of February, 1803, in the most formal and solemn manner (§§ 60–63) that no change should be introduced into either the ecclesiastical or the political constitution of the secularized countries, and that the relations of Church and State should remain the same as heretofore, though it was undeniable that secularization was most unjust.[1] But, in spite of this declaration, and as a direct consequence of the secularization, ecclesiastical jurisdiction was subject to a number of harassing restrictions, against which the bishops in vain protested or assented only on condition that a Concordat had been already concluded covering the cases in point.[2]

By the dissolution of the German Empire in 1806, the difficulties of the Church were increased. The ancient States of the Empire, now enjoying complete independence in the administration of their internal affairs, were moreover strengthened by fresh accessions of territory and by the incorporation of cities and principalities hitherto free; and having thus gained an increase of power, and availing themselves of the Second Article of the Consti-

[1] *Hist. of Prussia*, from the Peace of Hubertsburg (i. e. 1763) until the Second Capitulation of Paris (i. e. 1815), 1819; Vol. II., p. 46–53. Baron *von Hormayr*, Univ. Hist. of Coevil Times, Vienna, 1817, Vol. II., p. 205–218. *Gaspari*, Recess of the Deputation, Pt. II., p. 106. *Klüber*, Synopsis of the Congress of Vienna, Part II., p. 399.

[2] Reflections on the Situation of the Catholic Church within the Precincts of the Germanic Confederacy (not Rhenish, as the Fr. tr. has, Vol. IV., p. 60), Carlsruhe, 1818, p. 143. Cf., also, Inquiry into the Foundations of the Catholic Church in Germany, Frankfort, 1816.

Hosted by Google

tutive Act of the Confederation of the Rhine, repealing the laws of the German Empire, they showed no disposition to respect the rights of the Church, consecrated by immemorial usage, by the recesses of diets and the rescripts of emperors. Now, that these governments were sovereign, they refused to listen to any argument, even from Protestant writers, in defense of the rights of the Church. Notwithstanding that Napoleon had made freedom of Catholic worship a condition of admission for Protestant princes into the Confederation of the Rhine, the authority of the ordinaries was none the less subjected to numerous annoying restrictions, was sometimes ignored, and sometimes exercised by civil functionaries, who had hitherto busied themselves *circa sacra* in the name of the State. Hopes had been entertained that these affairs would be adjusted by a Concordat, but the negotiations upon which such hopes were founded came to nothing.

In 1807 *Della Genga*, Archbishop of Tyre, went as Papal Nuncio to Munich and Stuttgart, but his mission was fruitless, being frustrated by the influence of the minister, *Montgelas*, through whose efforts the slight hopes that were entertained of having the rights of the Church recognized were rendered still more desperate. Equally fruitless were the good offices of Napoleon, who, on the 21st of September, 1807, in a letter addressed through *M. de Champagny* to Cardinal *Caprara*,[1] obtained the Pope's consent to have negotiations opened at *Paris*, with a view to concluding a Concordat for Germany. Even on points the most necessary and essential, it seemed impossible to come to any understanding.

Finally, in 1814, when the Allies had reconquered the left bank of the Rhine, the Church of Germany began to entertain brighter hopes, which it was thought would be realized in the

CONGRESS OF VIENNA.[2]

The results of this Congress were by no means adequate to the true needs of the Church, the lawful wants of the people, or its own important and pacific mission. Among its members there was not a single influential and zealous defender of the rights of the Church. *Dalberg*, Archbishop of Ratisbon, who should have led in the matter, did not even appear in person in the Congress, and seemed to take no very great interest in its transactions. Not a single prince or statesman spoke a word in support of the rights of the Church. True, these were defended by the Papal Legate, Cardinal *Consalvi;* by *Wessenberg*, Vicar-general of Constance; by Baron *von Wambold*, Dean of the Chapter of Worms; by *Helfferich*, Prebendary of the Cathedral of Spire; and

[1] Archives historiques et politiques, Paris, 1819. See *Organon*, p. 6 sq.

[2] See the Notes of Cardinal *Consalvi*, dated November 17, 1814, and June 14, 1815, and the Memorial of *von Wessenberg*, Vic.-Gen. of Constance, dated November 27, 1814, reported in the *Organon*, p. 9 sq. *Klüber*, The Acts of the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815), Erlangen, 1835, 8 vols. By the *same*, Translation of the Diplomatic Proceedings of the Congress of Vienna, Frankfort, 1816. *Buss*, Authentic History of National and Territorial Churchdom, p. 792–808.

Hosted by Google

Schies, formerly Syndic of St. Andrew's, at Worms, then solicitor in the Superior Court at Mannheim, but their proposals were rejected and their reclamations unheeded.

Finding that all his efforts were vain, Cardinal *Consalvi* finally, on the 14th of June, 1815, *protested*[1] to the Congress, in the name of the Holy See, against all decisions injurious to the Catholic Church. As the Congress had failed to act, the German princes were obliged to apply directly to the Holy See for an adjustment of the ecclesiastical affairs of their several States.

To provide for the spiritual wants of his Catholic subjects, the King of *Würtemberg* had a *vicar-general* appointed at *Ellwangen*, and adopted many other measures of great utility. *Bavaria* was the first of the German States to conclude a Concordat with the Holy See, June 5, 1817, which, however, did not go into effect until September 8, 1821. The ecclesiastical affairs of *Prussia* were regulated by the bull *De salute animarum* of July 16, 1821, which was carried into execution two years later. In *Hanover*, besides a Concordat (1824,) referring especially to the dioceses of *Hildesheim* and *Osnabrück*, there was also the bull *Impensa Romanorum Pontificum*, similar in its provisions to that published for Prussia, and which, as regards the diocese of Hildesheim, has been only imperfectly carried out since 1828; while the dotation provided for in the diocese of Osnabrück, though an honest and earnest effort was made to raise it by *George V.*, was not paid until 1858.

In the hope of stimulating more prompt action and securing more favorable terms, the princes of *Würtemberg*, *Baden*, *Electoral-Hesse*, *Hesse-Darmstadt*, *Nassau*, and *Oldenburg* combined together, and in 1818 appointed at Frankfort *a committee on concordats*, charged with presenting their policy to the Holy See. Though as a whole the scheme was unsuccessful, Pius VII., by the bull *Provida solersque sollicitudo* of August 16, 1821, established an archbishopric at *Freiburg* for Baden, with *Rottenburg* in Würtemberg; *Limburg* in Nassau; *Mentz* in Hesse-Darmstadt; and *Fulda* in the Electorate of Hesse-Cassel as suffragan sees.[2] Finally, a Concordat was concluded

[1] *Florencourt*, Political Weekly, Cologne, 1854, Vol. I., nro. 11. "Protests entered by the Court of Rome against German Treaties of Peace."

[2] The New Ground-work of the Catholic System, according to Original Doc-

Hosted by Google

between *Holland* and the Holy See June 18, 1827. By most of these treaties the divisions of the dioceses were made to correspond with the political boundaries; the dotation of the Church in *real estate* fixed upon; chapters established; the method of communicating with the Holy See prescribed; and many other matters arranged. In the Grand Duchy of *Saxe-Weimar* no regard was paid to the wishes of those most interested in regulating the affairs of churches and schools, and in consequence the Vicar-General of Fulda entered a protest in 1823.[1]

In *Saxony*, where the Protestant ministers were fiercely intolerant and the Protestant population sensitively suspicious, the king did all he could under the circumstances to promote the spiritual well-being of his Catholic subjects by ordinances published February 10, 1827.

§ 397. *Pontificate of Leo XII.* (1823–1829) *and Pius VIII.* (1829, 1830).

Continuatio Bullarii from Clement XIII., Tom. XVI.–XVIII. † *Artaud*, Hist. du Pape Léon, Paris, 1843. New Hist., Book IV., pp. 793 sq. *Robiano*, T. IV.

The grief which the loss of Pius VII. caused the Church was in a measure alleviated by the elevation to the papal throne of Cardinal Hannibal della Genga, under the name of *Leo XII.* Owing to the tact and consummate ability displayed by della Genga in several important and delicate missions, he gained the confidence of Pius VII., by whom he was appointed Vicar-General of Rome. The first official acts of Pope Leo gave promise that the hopes his elevation had inspired would be realized. His earliest attention was given to those evils by which the Church was more particularly threatened, and in the encyclical letter, *Ut primum ad summi Pontificatus*, of May 3, 1824, all the bishops of the Catholic world were very earnestly urged to warn the faithful against the

uments and Reports, Stuttgart, 1821. Cf. "*The Catholic*," 1825, Vol. XVIII., p. 257–302. Cfr. infra, § 410.

[1] Cf. *Tübingen Quarterly*, 1824, p. 506 sq. and 727 sq. "*The Catholic*," 1825, Vol. XVI., p. 259 sq.

Hosted by Google

two most dangerous enemies of the age, viz., *religious indifference*, which leads straight to deism and materialism; and *Bible Societies*, which, under pretense of spreading a knowledge of the Sacred Writings, misrepresent their true sense in a thousand ways. This encyclical letter was bitterly denounced by Protestants, and ably defended by men like Sacy and Mezzofanti,[1] eminent alike for their learning and prudence. The bull *Quo graviora* of March 13, 1826, against the Carbonari, *Freemasons*,[2] and other secret societies, was perhaps less opportune. Finally, by the bull *Quod hoc ineunte saeculo*, the Pope proclaimed a jubilee for the year 1825. Owing to the political troubles by which Europe was distracted, the jubilee of 1800 had not been celebrated, and this was therefore the first one for fifty years. In the bull announcing the joyful event, after deploring the errors that threatened the Church and the hatred evoked against her Head, the Pope called upon the whole Christian world to give heed to his voice, and to avail themselves of the opportunity of grace within their reach during this year of expiation, indulgence, and reconciliation. Pursuing his wise measures for the restoration of the Universal Church, Leo intrusted the direction of the Roman College to the *Jesuits*, invited men of distinguished ability to fill chairs in other universities, re-established the Irish College, gave special attention to the German College, and restored order to a number of churches in which it had been disturbed by the storms of the revolution. Those countries of South America which had thrown off the yoke

[1] Journal des savans, année 1824. *Mezzofanti*, speaking of these Bibles, says: "In quibus versionibus vix dici potest, quot monstra, quot portenta in lucem edantur," and he adds that the spread of these translations in the East proves an obstacle to the propagation of the Gospel. See also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 106, and *Marshall*, Christian Missions.

[2] Cf. *Keller*, Univ. Hist. of Freemasonry, Giessen, 2d edit., 1860. *Guericke*, Manual of Ch. H., 9th edit., Vol. III., p. 334. *Eckart*, Armory, Furnishing Proof for the Condemnation of the Order of Freemasons, Schaffhausen, 1855 sq.; by the *same*, Mysteries of the Pagan Temple, *ibid.* 1860. *Hengstenberg*, Freemasonry and the Evangelical Pastorate, Berlin, 1854 sq, 3 vols. *Alban Stolz*, Mortar for Freemasons, 3d edit., Freiburg, 1862. *Acacia-twig*, by the same, 1863. Bp. Baron von *Ketteler*, May an Orthodox Christian be a Freemason? 5th ed., Mentz, 1865. *Chambers'* Cyclopaed., art. *Mason, Masons Free.*

Hosted by Google

of Spain, and proclaimed republican forms of government, now sent petitions to the Holy Father, requesting him to give them lawful pastors. Leo granted the requests of the new South American Republics, and in a consistory, held in June, 1827, provided for the reorganization of the hierarchies in these countries. At the request of *Dom Pedro I.*, a similar provision was made for the Empire of Brazil. Finally, he restored many of the schismatical churches of Asia to the unity of faith. But no effort of his apostolic zeal or demonstration of his paternal love could succeed in wholly extinguishing the last embers of Jansenism in the Netherlands.

The active and saintly life of this holy Pontiff was cut short by an unexpected death on the 10th of February, 1829. He was succeeded by Cardinal Castiglioni (March 31), who took the name of Pius VIII. Like his predecessor, the new Pontiff, in an encyclical letter of the 29th of May, warned the faithful against the dangers of religious indifference, Bible and secret societies, particularly that of *Freemasonry*, which, he said, favored indifference in religious matters, and turned men's minds away from the sources of positive teaching and the practices of the Church.[1]

As a temporal ruler, Pius VIII. was distinguished for his attention to the interests of the poorer classes, whom he provided with work and relieved of a portion of their taxes.

After the taking of Adrianople and the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Russia and the Porte, the Pope, as Head of the Universal Church, interposed in behalf of the Catholics of Armenia, who had been banished their country, and obtained for them the erection of an archbishopric in the very city of Constantinople, the recall of those in exile, the recognition of their rights, and the restoration of their property. At his urgent request, *Dom Pedro*, the Emperor of Brazil, abolished slavery within his States. But that which above everything else lends a special importance to his pontificate is the brief *Literis alteris abhinc*, which he addressed

[1] This encyclical is given in Latin in "*The Catholic*" of 1829, Vol. XXXIII., pp. 254–264. Cf. *Freemasonry*, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., pp. 65–78, and Vol. XLI. See also New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., pp. 834–845.

Hosted by Google

to the Archbishop of Cologne and his suffragans relative to *mixed* marriages.

As Pius VIII. had been encouraged in the beginning of his reign by the unexpected intelligence that the *Roman Catholic Emancipation Act* had been passed April 13, 1829, during the ministry of *Sir Robert Peel*, so also when his life was drawing to a close, the keen grief he felt at seeing the spirit of revolt abroad everywhere was in a measure softened by the news of the conquest of Algiers by the French, July 5, 1830, who thus broke up the dens in which pirates had sought refuge and their Christian victims had languished during many centuries. Bent under the weight of years, and overwhelmed with affliction at seeing the Church threatened by so many and so great disasters, Pius VIII. was called by Divine Providence to a better life on the 30th of November, 1830.

§ 398. *Pontificate of Gregory XVI.* (February 2, 1831—June 1, 1846).

Continuatio Bullarii from Clement XIII., T. XIX. Dizionario di erudizione, autore Gaetano Moroni, T. XXXI., art. "Gregorio." *Frederic Bülau*, Univ. Hist. of the Years 1830–1838, Lps. 1838. *W. Menzel*, The 120 Years from 1740–1860, Vols. IV. and V. *Rheinwald*, Acta historico-ecclesiastica, Years 1835–1837, Hamburg, 1838–1840. *von Reumont*, Hist. of Rome, Vol. III., Pt. II., p. 674 sq.

When Pius VIII. died, the whole of Europe was violently convulsed by the revolution of July, the shock which it produced being everywhere felt. Apart from the agitations of the Secret Societies, and notably of the *Carbonari*, Italy was just beginning to be stirred by the breath of French liberalism. In no country was the spirit of revolution, which was stimulated by the death of the late Pope, more intense. The revolt, which had broken out at Bologna, spread rapidly, and when the conclave, after fifty days of conclave, on the 2d of February, 1831, declared Cardinal *Mauro Capellari* Pope, it had reached the very gates of Rome. As this cardinal had but recently written a work celebrating the triumphs of the Holy See, the coincidence was somewhat remarkable.[1]

[1] Il Trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa, Roma, 1799; Venezia, 1822, and

Hosted by Google

The accession of *Gregory XVI.* was hailed with universal joy, and the opening of his pontificate signalized by deeds of beneficence and acts indicating his firmness of character. "We are encouraged by the thought," said the new Pontiff, in an encyclical letter, published three days after he had ascended the throne, "that our Father in Heaven will not send us trials beyond our strength." In those days of revolt and disorder it required a man of unshaken confidence and iron will to take upon him the temporal and spiritual government of the Church. Since Pius VIII. had been unsuccessful in suppressing the spirit of revolt in the Legations by his fatherly exhortations, the present Pope invoked the aid of Austria, and effected by arms what more conciliatory measures had failed to accomplish. Fearing that in the anarchy and disorder everywhere prevailing some churchmen might be led to forget their condition, Gregory XVI. wrote to the bishops of Poland and Belgium, strongly urging them not to mix up in political affairs, and reminding them that their ministry was a ministry of peace, and that subjects had duties toward their sovereigns which they might not refuse to perform. The organs of liberal opinion in Europe shortly after loudly proclaimed that the end of papal power and dignity had come at last. These sinister predictions were soon falsified. In an encyclical letter of August 15, 1832,[1] addressed to all the bishops of the Catholic world, the Pope proclaimed himself the enemy of the prevailing *false and dangerous spirit of innovation*, and solemnly avowed his intention of preserving and maintaining the ancient apostolic traditions. Once peace had been established in the States of the Church, the Pope devoted his energies to correcting old abuses and providing

many other editions; Germ., Augsburg, 1833, 2 pts. See New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., pp. 845 sq. On the 7th of January, twenty one votes were given to Cardinal *Giustiniani*, when, to the surprise of every one, the Spanish embassador *vetoed* the election of this distinguished churchman, who had for some considerable time been Nuncio at the Spanish Court. The right of veto was a privilege conceded to the Catholic Courts of France, Austria, and Spain. See *Groene*, Lives of the Popes, Vol. II., p. 487. (Tr.)

[1] *Bonn* Review of Philosophy and Catholic Theology, No. 3, pp. 197–208, where the original Latin text is given.

Hosted by Google

against new ones. In the autumn of 1833 the universities that had been closed during the revolutionary troubles were again opened and reorganized. Numerous works on *philosophy*, *dogmatic theology*, and *ecclesiastical and profane history* began now to make their appearance in the States of the Church.[1] Economical reforms were introduced into every

[1] Among the writers on philosophy we may mention the name of *Pasquale Galuppi*, Saggio filosofico sulla critica della coscienza, which was, in 1820 and 1827, followed by Pure and Applied Logic, and likewise by Moral Philosophy. Then came, in 1830, his New Investigations on the Origin of Ideas; of *Ventura* (de Methodo philosophandi), *Orsi*, *Anthony Rosmini-Serbati*, *Bonelli* (died at Rome on the 22d of October, 1840), and others. Cf. "Philosophy in Italy," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 243 sq., 298–306; Vol. XI., pp. 294–305, 470–479, 542–553, 665–671; four articles, written by an Italian. Cf., also, *Theological Archives* of Munich, Year II., A. D. 1843, nro. 4. Bonelli wrote Disquisitio historica praecipuorum philosophiae systematum, Romae, 1829; Institutiones logicae et metaphysicae, Romae, 1833, ed. II., 1835. As to Dogmatics, we quote *Perrone*, S. J. († 1876), Praelectiones Theologiae, 9 vols., Romae, 1835, which work has had upward of 30 editions, and has been translated into French and German. Praelectiones Theologiae, abridged from the above, 4 vols., 1845; 31st ed., 1864; both these works, 72 editions, until 1876; in fact, his lectures on theology since 1835 have superseded all others in nearly all the Catholic schools in both hemispheres. Perrone also wrote Synopsis Historiae Theologiae cum Philosophia comparatae, Romae, 1845; Turin, 1873. This part is generally found on the first pages of the Compendium; De Immaculato Conceptu B. V. Mariae, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit, Romae, 1847; Monasterii, 1849; Mediol. 1852. Thesis Dogmatica de Immac. B. V. M. Conceptione, Romae et Ratisbon., 1855. De Matrimonio Christiano, 3 vols., Romae, 1858; Leodii, 1861. De Virtutibus Fidei, Spei et Charitatis, Taurini, 1863 and 1867; Ratisb. 1865. De Virtute Religionis deque Mesmerismo, Somnambulismo et Spiritismo, Taurini, ed. II., 1867; Ratisb. 1866. De D. N. J. Christi Divinitate, 3 vols., Taurini, 1873. De Rom. Pont. infallibilitate, Taurini, 1874. Besides these dogmatical works, Father Perrone published many smaller ones on Catholic Controversy, all of which were originally written in Italian, but soon appeared in other languages. The principal one of them is Il Protestantesimo e la regola di fede, 3 vols., Rome, 1853. The Abbé Chassay, in his biographical notice of Father Perrone, gives a list of them. They are sixteen in number. (TR.) In Church History, *Delsignore*, Institutiones hist. eccl., ed. *Tizzani*, Romae, 1838 sq. For Exegesis, *Patritius*, S. J., De interpretatione script. sacr., Romae, ed. III., 1844. *Idem*, De evangeliis libri tres, 2 vols., 4to. In the department of Profane History, we mention *Garzetti's* work on the Situation and Constitution of Italy under the Roman Rule, ed. by *Marsiglio*, Milan, 1838, 3 vols. **Cesare Cantù*, Storia universale, Turin, 1837. Revised and reprinted at Palermo and Naples, 9th ed., 35 vols., Turin, 1864, and translated into German and French. The Germ. ed. is by *Bruehl*, Schaffhausen, 1849 sq., 13 vols.; 2d ed. continued by *Fehr*.

Hosted by Google

branch of the administration; high officers of State found guilty of either peculation or oppression were removed; all receipts and expenditures beginning with the year 1817 were closely examined to determine the legality of the privileges, pensions, and subsidies granted since that date; a new body of laws was promulgated in 1832, and a new penal code submitted to the judgment of the presidents of the various tribunals; a plan for a more equitable distribution of the tax levy on land was laid before deputies, who had come together from all parts of the Pontifical States;[1] chambers of commerce were established in Rome, in the cities of the provinces, and in all seaport towns; courts of appeal and criminal courts were thenceforth to be presided over by non-clerical judges; strict and impartial justice was dealt out to all alike;[2] the arts and sciences were encouraged with a munificence equaled only by the enlightened taste with which they were appreciated; the Etruscan Museum was founded in the Vatican; and finally the *Basilica of St. Paul's*, which had been destroyed by fire on the 15th and 16th of July, 1823, was again built up from its ruins.[3] Such were some of the domestic labors that marked the early years of the pontificate of Gregory XVI., who, after having been raised to the papal throne, con-

[1] *Tournon* (Études statistiques sur Rome, Paris, 1831) says: "There is perhaps no country in which it is more difficult to carry out reforms than in the States of the Church; for in no other country are there so many interests to be consulted, and in no other country is it so easy to make mistakes, which would increase rather than diminish abuses." And he adds that though the government is the most absolute in *form*, in *reality* its administration is exceptionally mild and humane. Tournon was Prefect of Rome under Napoleon from 1810 to 1814.

[2] The office of Uditore Santissimo was abolished in 1831, and as a warning to all that no profession, and least of all the clerical, should enjoy any immunities from the penalties of crime, Gregory XVI., on the 4th of October, 1843, caused a Piedmontese priest, named *Dominic Abo*, to be beheaded in the Castle of Sant' Angelo in punishment of his guilt.

[3] Gregory XVI. addressed a circular letter to all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Christian world, requesting contributions for the restoration of this splendid monument, raised to the honor of the *Apostle of the Gentiles*. It had withstood the vicissitudes of fifteen centuries, and previously to the Reformation was, as the national Church of England, under the special patronage of her kings.

Hosted by Google

tinued to live the life of a simple monk, observing the austere Rule of the Camaldolese, sleeping upon the floor, eating little, keeping late vigils, never idle, and praying always.[1] He gathered about his person the greatest men of his age, and employed their talents in his service. Cardinal *Lambruschini*, equally distinguished for learning and statesmanship, was appointed his secretary of state, in which office he set forth and maintained, under the most trying circumstances, the true principles and polity of the Catholic Church. As Leo X, in a former age, had rewarded the virtues and talents of *Bembo* and *Sadolet*, by making them members of the Sacred College, so now did Gregory confer a similar mark of appreciation upon the scholarly *Angelo Mai* († 1854) and *Mezzofanti*, the marvelous linguist († 1849).[2]

The tender heart of Gregory XVI., which had but recently been comforted by the peaceful settlement of affairs in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Poland, was overwhelmed with grief when he learned that *Spain*, that country of glorious Catholic traditions, was also convulsed by the conflicts of civil strife, her constitution overturned, her faith dimmed, and her attachment to the Holy See weakened; that one of the ablest and most eloquent defenders of Christianity and the Church had lighted the torch of revolt at the altar of God, and prostituted the words of Holy Writ to justify contempt of authority, hatred of kings, rebellion, and all the train of evils that follow in its wake; that Clement, the venerable *Archbishop of Cologne*, and the holy Archbishop of *Gnesen* and *Posen*, had been violently thrust from their sees; and, finally, that the Greeks, who had been restored to unity during the pontificate of Clement VIII., had been once more torn from communion with Rome by means the most despicable and atrocious. There was no duty of his high office that Gregory left unperformed. He warned the faithful against the errors contained in the systems of *Hermes* and *Bautain*, and against the dangerous and wicked tendencies of the teachings of the Abbé *de Lamennais;* he protested against the violation of the rights

[1] Cf. *Geramb*, Journey from La Trappe to Rome, p. 127, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1839.

[2] On *Mezzofanti*, see Hist. and Polit. Papers, Vol. X., pp. 200 sq. and 271 sq.

Hosted by Google

of bishops by the King of Prussia; and, having remonstrated to no purpose with the Tzar of Russia, published, July 22, 1842, an allocution, addressed to the cardinals,[1] in which, after recounting the tyrannical acts of that autocrat, he bitterly complained of the sad condition of the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire. By this last act Gregory closed the mouths of the enemies of the Holy See, who reproached him with neglecting one of his most sacred duties in averting his eyes from the misfortunes of these poor people, and in ceasing to defend the rights of the Church, from fear of giving offense to the Autocrat of the North (December 13, 1845). By the firmness, fortitude, and prudence which he displayed in encountering the storms raised against him in the North, in the East, and in the West, Gregory made for himself a name in history which will never be obscured; and future generations will some day render proper homage to the shining merits of this illustrious successor of St. Peter. He died June 1, 1846.

§ 399. *The Catholic Church in France under the Bourbons.*

By the Constitutional Charter of July 4, 1814, *Louis XVIII.* granted toleration to every form of worship, but, consistently with the religious traditions of his House, declared the *Catholic* to be the religion of the State. Hoping to find in religion the surest support of his still insecure power, he put forth his best efforts to strengthen the authority of the Church in France, to revive the teachings of faith, and encourage religious habits in those Frenchmen who for a half of a century

[1] The allocution and the leading facts are found in the pamphlet entitled "The Czar and the Successor of St. Peter," by *Sausen*, Mentz, 1843. "Persecutions and Sufferings of the Catholic Church in Russia," a work based on unpublished documents, by a former Russian Counsellor of State, Paris, 1842. Cf. *Theiner*, Situation of the Catholic Church of the Two Rites in Poland and Russia, from Catharine II. down to to our own times. Review of the History of Russia, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. V., pp. 4–16, 98 sq., 129 sq.; Vol. IX., p. 698 sq. Relations of the Russian Church to Constantinople and Her Thraldom under the Autocracy of the Czar, *ibid.*, Vol. X., p. 768 sq.; Vol. XI., p. 120 sq. Gregory XVI. and the Emperor of all the Russias, *ibid.*, Vol. X., p. 455–491, 583 sq., 647 sq.

Hosted by Google

had been by turns political enthusiasts, votaries of pleasure, gallant soldiers, industrious workmen, Christians when it was fashionable and a mark of good breeding to be such,[1] at all times impressionable, easily led astray and prompt to return. Many obstacles, however, stood in the way of the accomplishment of this noble design.

Missionaries sent among the people to preach the Gospel were at times imprudently zealous, and, by their unseemly conduct in some places, laid themselves open to the biting sarcasm and vituperative calumny of their polemical adversaries, and gave color of excuse to the petitions that were sent up to the Chambers against them, and to the popular uprisings that took place at Brest and Paris. Those who had passed their youth among the terrible scenes of the Revolution had ceased to relish any writings except those of Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, Helvetius, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which, having been forbidden to be published by Napoleon, now, that the press had become free, appeared in thousands of editions, and were sold at a price so trifling as to place them within the reach of every one. The evil influences of these works were in a measure counteracted by the *Catholic Society*, under the direction of *Duke Matthew de Montmorency, for the diffusion of Catholic literature*. The bishops, in a letter dated May 30, 1819, laid a statement of the condition of affairs before the Pope, sorrowfully deploring their existence. But before the Church in France could make any real progress toward reconstruction, it was of the first importance that the vacant sees should be filled, and a period put to the condition of uncertainty resulting from the Concordat of 1801.

After the failure of the mission of M. *de Persigny*, formerly Bishop of Saint-Malo, and subsequently Archbishop of Paris, Count *de Blacas*, the king's minister, was sent to Rome to open negotiations, with a view to concluding a new Concordat. Of the difficulties to be set aside, only two were of great consequence, namely, the obligation of the clergy to take the oath prescribed by the Charter, and the refusal of the old bishops to resign their sees. The former was set aside by assurance of Count de Blacas that the oath bound only within the limits of civil obedience, and in no way interfered with the duties of clergymen to God and to the Church; and the latter ceased to exist after the disinterested declaration, drawn up at Paris, November 8, 1816, by the six bishops concerned, to the effect that they were willing to do whatever the Holy Father, the king, and the well-being of the Church in France might require.[2] *The new Concordat*, signed by both the Holy See and Louis XVIII. on the 11th of July, and published by papal bull eight days later, *restored the one entered into between Leo X. and Francis I.* at Bologna in 1515, and provided for the abrogation of the Concordat of 1801 and the abolition of the *Organic Laws*, in

[1] Cf. *Boost*, New Hist. of France, 1st ed., pp. 322 sq.; *Gams*, New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk IV., pp. 655 sq.

[2] This document is given in the New Hist. of the Church of Christ, Bk. IV., pp. 714 sq.; also the Concordat of 1817. See the original Latin text in *Roviano*, Vol. III., pp. 403–420.

Hosted by Google

so far as these conflicted with the teachings and laws of the Church. Of the sees suppressed by the bull *Qui Christi Domini*, of November 29, 1801, forty-seven were to be restored, and the sixty archbishoprics and bishoprics erected in the same year were to remain unchanged, and the actual incumbents to retain undisturbed possession. Should, however, any new division of either the old dioceses or the new be deemed necessary or advantageous, it might not be made except with the consent of the bishops, or of the chapters of such bishoprics as chanced to be vacant. Churches were to have adequate endowments, either in real estate or in incomes, secured by the government, and special attention was to be given to the organization of seminaries. Desirous of promptly carrying into effect an instrument so favorable to the Church, the Pope was just about to publish a bull relative to the new division of the dioceses, when the Chambers rejected the Concordat, on the ground that the bishoprics were excessive in number, and that it contained many articles inimical to the Liberties of the Gallican Church. In 1822 a temporary arrangement was entered into between the Pope and the King, with the consent of the Chambers, by which the number of bishoprics was increased to eighty, fourteen of which were metropolitan and sixty-six suffragan sees. Cathedral chapters were also organized, and greater and smaller seminaries and faculties of theology established. There was a great lack of priests, and although the number ordained in 1823 was two hundred in excess of those who died in the same year, there were still thirteen thousand required to fill the vacant posts and offices. The king now called attention to the revenues of the Church, and the Chambers in consequence voted a subsidy of 3,900,000 francs, thus rendering the position of the clergy more secure and independent. After a gallant struggle, in which he displayed the marvelous powers of his fervid eloquence, *Chateaubriand* obtained for the clergy the right of accepting grants of real estate, and the property accumulated from this source in a short time was valued at two millions of francs. The clergy, on their part, were both zealous and devoted. They searched out and brought together, in an establishment specially set apart for the purpose, a large number of Savoyard children, who had hitherto been given over to every vice, and permitted to grow up without religious instruction of any kind. The Abbé *Loewenbroek*, a native of Lorraine, devoted himself to the service of the German workingmen, of whom there were at times twenty-five thousand in Paris, and whose religious wants and instruction had been previously wholly neglected. The Abbé *Arnoux* opened a reformatory for criminals. The *Priests of the Mission*, who, by an ordinance of October, 1816, had been permitted to return to their former houses, and the Priests of the Holy Ghost, hastened to place themselves at the disposal of the bishops, to do service in communities that had been deprived of their pastors. The Trappists returned to France, took possession of their ancient abbey of Meilleray, and, by fidelity to their austere Rule, once more revived purity of morals among their countrymen.

The *Brothers of the Christian Schools* and the *Ursuline Nuns* entered joyfully upon their work of instructing and educating the youth of both sexes. Pious laymen also formed themselves into holy associations for the instruction of youth, the diffusion of wholesome literature, the promotion of the missions, the service of the sick, and other such charitable offices as were required by the

Hosted by Google

growing needs of religion.[1] The most important of these was the *Society for the Propagation of the Faith*, founded at Lyons in 1822.

People no longer dared, as in days gone by, to make a boast of their infidelity in good society. *Lamartine* (b. 1790, d. 1869)[2] was the favorite poet of the better educated classes, and his poems, which breathe a deeply religious and Christian spirit, replaced in public admiration the pagan and impious literature of the eighteenth century. Others also contributed largely to bring about this revolution in public taste, and among them the Abbé *de Lamennais* (b. 1782, d. 1854),[3] the eloquent defender of the infallibility of the Church, and the bold and spirited adversary of Gallicanism; *de Maistre* (b. 1754, d. 1821),[4] that splendid genius and great writer; *Bonald* (b. 1754, d. 1840),[5] the powerful advocate of civil and particularly of ecclesiastical authority; *Frayssinous* (b. May 9, 1765, d. May 31, 1841),[6] the able Christian apologist; and

[1] There were, in 1825, 2,833 institutions belonging to Religious Orders of females, and of these 1,533 received subsidies from government.

[2] Méditations poétiquès, Paris, 1820. Nouvelles Méditations, Paris, 1823. Harmonies poétiques et religieuses, Paris, 1830, 2 vols. Chant du Sacre, Paris, 1825.

[3] Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion, Paris, 1817 sq., 2 vols. A little later on, together with the Défense de l'essai, 5 vols., Paris, 1827. De la Religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil, Paris, 1825; 3d edit., 1826. Mélanges, Paris, 1826. Des Progrès de la revolution et de la guerre contre l'Église, Paris, 1829.

[4] Du Pape, Lyons, 1819; Par. 1820, 2 vols.; English by *McD. Dawson;* Germ. by *M. Lieber*, Frankfort, 1822. De l'église gallicane, etc., Lyons and Paris, 1821; Germ. by *Klee*, Frkft. 1824. Les Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg, ou Entretiens sur le gouvernement temporel de la Providence, 2 vols., Paris, 1821; Germ. by *Lieber*, with Dissertations by *Windischmann*, Frkft. 1825.

[5] Oeuvres, 21 vols., Paris, 1817, to which was added: Démonstration philosophique des principes constitutifs de la société, Paris, 1830. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XII., p. 124; Fr. tr., Vol. 3, p. 190 sq.

[6] Notice sur la vie de Mgr. Frayssinous, évêque d'Hermopolis, par le *baron Henrion*. *Frayssinous*, Défense du christianisme, ou Conferences sur la religion. These lectures on the proofs of Christianity, delivered in the church of St. Sulpice, between the years 1803 and 1809, and again between 1814 and 1822, made his reputation. The cultivated youth of the capital were drawn by the splendor of his genius and the charm of his eloquence, and thus prevented from being carried away by the popular philosophy of the day. Between the years 1825 and 1843, fifteen editions of the Défense du Christian-

Hosted by Google

Boulogne († May 13, 1825),[1] the intrepid bishop and great preacher. Writers hitherto hostile to the Church retracted their errors and bore witness to the truth of Christianity. *Peter Henry Larcher*, the celebrated Greek scholar (b. 1736, d. 1812), disavowed the notes, which he, assisted by some pretentious philosophers, had written on Herodotus, the scope of which was, not to render testimony to historic truth, but to undermine the foundations of the Christian religion by throwing discredit upon the chronology of Holy Writ. In 1820 the famous *Jean-Baptiste Robinet* also repudiated his work, *Livre de la Nature*, in which he aimed at destroying all religious principles and extinguishing all religious feeling.

Louis XVIII. died September 19, 1824, and during the reign of his successor, *Charles X.*, the conflict between the Royalists and the Constitutionalists raged more fiercely than ever. Even wise and moderate men were not agreed as to how far the influence of the Church should extend. Charles X. showed a disposition to strengthen the authority of the Church and to set his face against the spirit of revolution. With this view he endeavored to have the Chamber of Deputies pass a *law on sacrilege* (1825), punishing with severe penalties any offense against the religion of the State. On the other hand, the Gallican tenets were vigorously attacked by an illustrious writer, the Abbé de Lamennais, and a number of French cardinals, archbishops, and bishops drew up and laid before the king, April 3, 1826, a statement of their grievances, which, some time later, received the approval of sixty other prelates.

On the 25th of May, 1827, the Minister of Public Worship, Mgr. Frayssinous, Bishop of Hermopolis *in partibus*, rose in the Chamber of Deputies and repelled the charges of ambition and ultramontanism imputed to many of the clergy, and gave a clear statement of the policy of the government. While freely allowing that the intentions and efforts of

isme, in 3 vols., were published, and the work has been translated into many languages. Germ., Pesth, 1830, 4 pts.

[1] Oeuvres, Paris, 1826 sq.; 8 vols., Germ., by *Raess* and *Weis*, Frkft. 1830 sq., 4 vols.

Hosted by Google

Charles X. to forward the interests of religion in his dominions were praiseworthy, it must be also acknowledged that he lacked the qualifications necessary to regenerate his people. Like the Jesuits and those who were spending themselves on the missions for the weal of others, he was assailed by irreligious and revolutionary agitators, who, during a period of bloody and ceaseless wars, when religious instruction was no longer given, had been corrupted to the very core by the reading of immoral and infidel works. Symptoms calculated to excite alarm began to manifest themselves in some cities of the kingdom.[1] The party, which during a revolution that filled France and the whole of Europe with terror, and under the Empire that succeeded, had expiated in one or other of the eight imperial bastiles the slightest revolutionary act, began now to revive under the imbecile rule of the Bourbons. The banner of liberty was again hoisted; religion and its ministers derided; morality attacked with sophisms a thousand times repeated and as often refuted; every possible means employed to excite the passions of the discontented and to rouse into action that dangerous element of every population that is ever desirous of change; the wildest political theories proclaimed; and the government itself ridiculed and made an object of contemptuous derision. As to the government, it must be said that, though weak, it meant well, and though zealous for good, it was destitute alike of the energy and prudence necessary to accomplish it, and, while intent upon maintaining itself, daily lost ground by making injudicious concessions. Availing themselves of the exclusive and illiberal privileges of the *University* founded by Napoleon, the members of the Opposition demanded that the seven colleges under the direction of the Jesuits should be closed, and the king, by royal ordinance of July 16, 1828, granted their demand.[2] Emboldened by every fresh concession, they extended their operations from Paris to all the departments; directed the action of the electors; established affiliated societies to aid in controlling the elections; and by degrees in-

[1] *Boost*, New Hist. of France, 1st ed., pp. 330 sq.

[2] *Robiano*, l. c., T. IV., p. 212; and "*The Catholic*" of 1828, nro. 12.

Hosted by Google

creased the number of their Deputies in the Chamber. Affairs came to a crisis under the ministry of *M. de Martignac*, through whose prudent management the government was still enabled to retain a measure of public confidence. New demands on the part of the government called forth an unexpected resistance, and Charles X., weary of yielding where to yield was worse than useless, promptly declared that he would make no further concessions, and that in future he would act as the interests of the throne and of religion seemed to require. Relying upon the advice and support of those immediately about him, he dismissed the Martignac ministry, which alone was able to harmonize conflicting parties and uphold the uncertain fortunes of royalty. The new aggressive policy now inaugurated gave offense to all parties, and made them a unit against the government. New cabinets were successively formed and dismissed, until finally the one presided over by *Prince de Polignac*, which Talleyrand ironically styled *the impossible ministry*, was appointed. When conciliatory measures would not answer, this minister attempted to awe the public into submission (expedition to Algiers, etc.); but the press, which nothing could silence, kept up its attacks, which became daily more violent and personal. In reply to a speech from the throne, on the occasion of the opening of the Chambers on the 2d of March, 1830, an address, declaring that the ministry did not enjoy the confidence of the country, was carried by a vote of 221 against 181. The king, in consequence, by an ordinance of the 16th of May, declared the Chamber of Deputies dissolved. A new election took place, and the 221 were again returned, without exception. Charles, seeing that affairs were desperate, determined to take advantage of the somewhat vague wording of the Fourteenth Article of the Charter, empowering the sovereign "to make regulations and decrees necessary for the execution of the laws and the safety of the State," and on the 26th of July published his *five celebrated ordinances* in the *Moniteur*. These suspended the liberty of the press; dissolved the newly elected Chamber of Deputies; reduced the number of Deputies from 430 to 258; convoked the two Chambers to meet the 28th of the

Hosted by Google

following September; and made some new royalist appointments for the Council of State. The editors and publishers of newspapers, headed by M. Thiers, then editor of the *National*, protested against the ordinances. On the following day, July 27, a conflict took place in the streets between the gendarmes and the citizens; on the 28th Paris was declared in a state of siege, and in an encounter with the populace the royalist troops were victorious; on the 29th, owing to some blundering and the defection of two regiments, the mob gained possession of the Tuileries, compelled the king's forces to withdraw from Paris, dethroned the elder branch of the Bourbons, and transferred the government to the *Duke of Orleans*, who took the title of *Louis Philippe I.* By the Protestants this change of government was hailed as the beginning of a new era for Protestantism in France; but their predictions were premature, and were destined not to be verified by the events that followed.

§ 400. *Continuation—The Catholic Church in France under Louis Philippe.*

Crétineau-Joly, Histoire de Louis Philippe d'Orléans et de l'Orléanisme, Paris, 1862. *Boost*, New Hist. of France, 5th period, p. 344 sq. *L. Blanc*, Histoire de dix ans, chap. 18. *W. Menzel*, l. c., Vols. IV. and V. *Scharpf*, Lectures on New Ch. H., nro. 1, p. 67–135. *Gams*, l. c., Vol. III., p. 72 sq.

The Church in France did not escape the storm that overturned the throne of the Bourbons in 1830. By the new Charter, the Catholic religion was declared to be, not the religion of the State, but the religion of the majority of the French people.

Although the Pope, in reply to an inquiry from Mgr. *de Quelen*, Archbishop of Paris, authorized the usual prayers to be said for King Louis Philippe, and instructed the bishops to submit to the new government, the clergy long continued to be regarded with suspicion by their implacable enemies of the liberal party.

Owing to some imprudent conduct of the Legitimists, on the occasion of the funeral service of the *Duke de Berry*, in the church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, February 14, 1831,

Hosted by Google

a fanatical mob, already maddened by excessive indulgence, it being the season of carnival, rushed in and sacked the church, and hurrying thence to the archbishop's palace, perpetrated similar outrages. For two days an infuriated multitude rushed through the streets, everywhere erasing the fleur-de-lis from the escutcheon of France, and sacking churches. They were at length overcome by the National Guard.[1] To these shocking scenes succeeded the ravages of disease. The cholera, a plague hitherto unknown in Europe, raged with such violence in Paris that in one day alone (April 10, 1832) eighteen hundred persons fell victims to the scourge. The first appointments to bishoprics after the revolution of July did not prove to be the very best that could be made.[2] Associated with *Montalembert*, *Gerbet* and *Lacordaire*, Abbé *de Lamennais*, who believed himself called to exercise a powerful influence on the political and religious future of France, started a journal, which bore the significant title of *l'Avenir*, and the motto "God and Freedom." An ardent advocate of the complete independence of the Church, and a determined enemy of all State interference in spiritual affairs, he pushed his principles to their last consequences, maintaining that the clergy should decline to accept any salary from government,[3] and that the Church, once more reduced to her condition of poverty in the primitive ages, would no longer place her trust in anything save in the power of Him, who alone is her true Head. To these questions of discipline he soon joined others of a strictly doctrinal character, concerning which he held wholly erroneous views, as, for example, that the subjective ground and reality of certitude are not in the individual reason, but in the universal reason and general acceptance (*sensus communis*) of mankind.[4] The views of de Lamennais on the complete severance of Church and State and on the

[1] *The Catholic*, Oct. nro. of 1831. Mgr. *de Quelen* pendant dix ans, par *J. F. Bellamare*, Paris, 1843.

[2] *Bonn* Periodical, No. 51, pp. 204, 205.

[3] *The Catholic*, year 1831; Jan. nro. of 1833; Sept. Append., p. XLI.; Dec. Append., p. XXXVII; A. D. 1834, Febr. Append., p. XXV. sq.; March Append., p. LI. sq.

[4] *Bonn* Philosophical and Theological *Review*, nro. 19, p. 177.

Hosted by Google

sensus communis were condemned by Gregory XVI. in an encyclical letter of the 15th of August, 1832. All the bishops of France prohibited the reading of *l'Avenir* in their dioceses, and the publication of the journal was in consequence suspended. M. de Lamennais retracted, but the Pope suspected his sincerity, and his fears were justified when, some time later, *Les Paroles d'un Croyant* and *Le Livre du Peuple*, both written with fervid eloquence and extraordinary brilliancy, made their appearance.[1] With a strange confusion of the most elementary ideas, the author advocated the murder of kings, the assumption by the clergy of the leadership in popular insurrections, and the adoption of the cross as the universal standard of nations in revolt, and appealed to the Gospel as a sanction for his wild vagaries. His words are seemingly the words of the Gospel, being in fact a horrid travesty of the Sacred Writings, put together with a view to incite to crime. Being no longer able to simulate the character of a priest, the Abbé de Lamennais at length threw off all disguise, and was regarded by all as a democrat and Jacobin of the most extreme school. But though he voluntarily cut himself off from communion with the Church he desired to make the embodiment of revolution, he failed to bring with him any of that brilliant cluster of men who had encouraged his early efforts and shared his first labors; and the *Abbé Gerbet*, now that the friend of his youth had become the enemy of all that he himself held most dear, after a painful struggle with his feelings, entered the lists against him.[2]

[1] Paroles d'un Croyant, Paris, 1833. *Bautain*, Réponse d'un chrétien aux paroles d'un croyant, Strasbourg et Paris, 1834. Paroles d'un voyant à M. de Lamennais par *Ch. Faider*, Bruxelles, 1834. Paroles d'un croyant, par l'abbé de Lamennais quand il était croyant, Brux. 1828. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Reflections on some Writings of de Lamennais, Jena, 1834. *Carové*, Criticism of the Pilgrims of Mickiewicz; of the Words of a Believer, by Lamennais; of the Answers of *Bautain*, *Faider*, etc. Conf. the Review made thereon by Dr. *Hock*, in the *Bonn* Periodical, nro. 20, p. 103–126; conf. *ibid.*, nro. 10, p. 145–165, and nro. 11, p. 192 sq.

[2] Abbé *Gerbet* wrote the following lines on the subject: "On sent tout ce que ces paroles me coutent. Celui qui déclare une guerre ouverte à l'église, qui prophétise sa ruine, qui, dans les dernières pages de l'écrit qu'il vient de publier, n'a pas craint d'outrager, par le plus brutal sarcasme, l'auguste vieillard, que la chrétienté salue du nom de Père, a eu en moi un ancien ami, qui l'aimait d'une

Hosted by Google

Another pretended reformer, the *Abbé Châtel*, formerly a chaplain in the army, followed a less circuitous route for the accomplishment of his object. Believing the Revolution of July favorable to the establishment of a "French Catholic Church," he began to proclaim his new teachings in August, 1830.

Shortly after the Revolution, he published a profession of faith, had himself consecrated bishop by Fabre-Palaprat, a "Constitutional" prelate, and opened a place of meeting in a rented hall in the faubourg Saint-Denis, in Paris, where he officiated as primate of the new religion. He held Christ to be only a model-man, abolished the confessional, fasting, and celibacy, denied the infallibility of the Church, and recognized no rule of faith other than the individual reason. Retaining only a few external forms of Catholic worship, and preaching a rank and superficial rationalism,[1] it is somewhat puzzling how he could have designated his new system, if such it can be called, the "*Catholic Church.*" He was not more successful than misguided reformers have ever been, and seems to have had only very indistinct and inaccurate notions of the principles upon which his reform was based, not unfrequently rejecting and refuting to-day what he had taught and upheld yesterday. Of all subjects, religious ones were the most distasteful to him. His sermons were by turns dogmatical and political, blasphemous and ridiculous. For example, one day he would begin by saying that he was about to preach on the dignity of women, and at the close of his discourse would distribute bouquets to the ladies; and the next, that divine service would be held in honor of Napoleon, whom he had placed upon his new calendar of saints. In his catechism[2] he taught that the natural law comprehends the whole of religion; that Christ had died a martyr to this belief; and that His death was sublime only because it was a witness to its truth. The teachings of the Abbé Châtel never exerted a very wide influence, and his sect gradually dwindled away after its places of meeting had been closed by order of the government in 1842. It again revived after the Revolution of February 24, 1848, but was again suppressed by the civil authority in 1850. The Abbé himself remained obstinate, publishing for a time a journal

amitié née au pied des autels, et qui avait pour lui autant de dévouement, je crois, qu'aucun des amis nouveaux, qui sont venus courtiser sa révolte. A ce souvenir je tombe à genoux, offrant pour lui à Dieu des prières, dans lesquelles il n'a plus foi; et je ne me relève que pour combattre *dans l'ami de ma jeunesse l'ennemi de tout ce que j'aime d'un éternel amour.* (Université cathol., recueil philosoph., scientif. et litt., T. III. et IV., Paris, 1837.) *Abbé Gerbet*, Apostasy from the Vital Principle of the Church and the State, being a Germ. trans. fr. the French, Augsburg, 1839.

[1] *Geramb*, Journey to Rome, p. 50.

[2] *Fr. Kuntsmann*, The Sect of Abbé Châtel (Freiburg Theol. Review, Vol. III., nro. 1, p. 57 sq.) Catéchisme à l'usage de l'église cath. franç. par l'abbé Châtel, Par. 1837. Réforme radicale, Nouvel Eucologe à l'usage de l'église cath., III. éd., Par. 1839. Cf. *Tübing.* Quarterly, 1832, p. 698 sq.

Hosted by Google

at Brussels, in which he defended his opinions, and ending his days as a postmaster in 1857. *Auzou*, one of his leading disciples, had been a seminarist at Versailles, and after his expulsion had himself ordained by Poulard, receiving all the orders in a single day. He subsequently repented, and was reconciled to the Church, begging all those whom he had led astray to follow his example.

Sharing the opinion of Châtel, that the events of the July Revolution marked the opening of an era favorable to their purposes, the Freemasons, who, under the name of *Templars*, had secretly established a Lodge in Paris at the commencement of the eighteenth century, began now to publicly put forward their claims to be regarded as the original Church. After being for a time the object of some curiosity, they passed out of public view, having excited no permanent interest in their pretensions.

The Revolution of 1830, which had called into life so many and so various interests, passions, aspirations, and sects, inspired the disciples of *Saint-Simon*[1] with the idea of forming a regular organization, which, after attracting for a short time a large share of public attention, ceased to exist. Claude Henri, Count de Saint-Simon, the founder of the *Saint-Simonians*, was born in Paris, October 17, 1760. He belonged to a noble and ancient family, was educated in the philosophical principles of the eighteenth century, entered the army when only eighteen, served in the American War of Independence, and distinguished himself on the day of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown. Tiring of the profession of arms, he began to study politics, devoting himself especially to the constitutions of the new American Republics. On his return to France he found everything in a state of fermentation, and, while abstaining from openly taking part in the Revolution, he sympathized with its aspirations and approved its aim, believing it to be the beginning of a new era, in which, not only the political, but the moral and religious orders, would be regenerated. Anxious to contribute what he could toward bringing about so happy a condition of things, he began to dream of reorganizing the sciences and reconstructing the social fabric. Knowing, however, as yet, comparatively little of the sciences, he took a house near the *École Polytechnique*, and invited to his table its professors of mathematics, physics, and astronomy; and, having gained the desired knowledge in these branches, changed his lodgings, and settling down in the neighborhood of the *École de Médicine*, adopted the same plan with the physiologists, from whom he learned something of the structure of organized bodies. He also traveled in England, Switzerland, and Germany, and in 1807,

[1] *Saint-Simon*, Lettres d'un habitant à Genève, 1802. Introd. aux travaux scientifiques du 19e siècle, Par. 1807, 2 T., 4to. De la réorganisation de la société europ. 1814. Catéchisme des industriels, Par. 1824. Le Nouveau Christianisme, Par. 1825. Doctrine de Saint-Simon, Par. (1828), éd. 3, 1831, T. I. *Lechevalier*, Enseignement central, Par. 1831. Rel. Saint-Simon association universelle, Paris, 1831. Criticisms of this work see in the Tübing. Quart., 1832. Procès en police correctionnelle, Par. 1832. **Moehler*, Saint-Simonism (Complete works, Vol. II., p. 34–53). (Tr.): See also *Saint-Simon*, Sa vie et ses travaux, by *Hubbart*, Paris, 1859. Oeuvres choisies de Saint-Simon, published by *Enfantin*, in 3 vols., Brussels, 1859; new ed., Paris, 1861; and complete and joint edition of both Saint-Simon and Enfantin's works, 20 vols., 1865–1869.

Hosted by Google

during the Empire, as one of the competitors for a prize offered by Napoleon, published his *Introduction to the Scientific Works of the Nineteenth Century*, besides many others, all of which were ill received. All his plans miscarried. Driven to despair by financial ruin, he attempted to commit suicide, but only succeeded in putting out one of his eyes; and, two years later, May 29, 1825, died surrounded by a few of his disciples.

Saint-Simon held that Christianity is a harsh and comfortless religion; that the principle, "*Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's*," divides men into two unequal classes, and gives rise to an unfair distribution of happiness and misery; that the contrast between the ideal and real life of man, between the world here below and the world beyond the grave, is still more prominently brought out by the appliances of modern industry, by which the earth is changed into a place of sorrow and a vale of tears; that Christianity, having no longer any mission to fulfil, should give room to new forces and to a superior wisdom, capable of putting an end to this contrast, and of securing to man the real happiness his heart yearns for, not alone in the life to come, as promised by the Gospel, but also in the present one; that Protestantism had a negative office to perform, namely, that of destroying Catholicity and dividing the Christian world, and had done its work; and, finally, that to Saint-Simonianism was reserved the positive work of inaugurating the golden age of the *Everlasting Gospel*. The revelation supplied by Saint-Simon, so his disciples claim, embraces at once body and soul, God and the world; combines in one system the spiritual truths of Catholicity and those of materialistic philosophy; and, finally, produces the happiness and eternal brotherhood which Christianity promised, but never realized. Henceforth *all* shall have equal rights in property, which belongs to God, and is held in trust by man; the law of inheritance shall be abolished; and in the course of time there shall be a community of goods. Also, no family shall be exclusively engaged in the tillage of the soil or in the menial services of society; every one shall receive reward according to his gifts and capacity; society shall be wholly under the control of the ministers of God; and the hierarchy shall consist of priests, theologians, and deacons. In religion the Saint-Simonian form of government shall be theocratic; in unity, monarchical; in talent, virtue, and the merit of its leading members, aristocratical; but, consonantly with its aim, which is the happiness of the greatest number, in whatever is requisite to secure this, democratical.

Even during the lifetime of Saint-Simon his theories were embraced by such eminent men as *Auguste Comte*, the founder of "Positive Philosophy," and *Augustin Thierry*, the celebrated historian; and after his death they found eloquent defenders in Messrs. *Olinde*, *Rodrigues*, *Michael Chevalier*, and *Herminier*. The means employed to spread the Saint-Simonian Society were incessant preaching, frequent missions, and pamphlets, which poured from the press without number. It was especially popular among the working classes of the larger cities, and fell to pieces only when *Father Enfantin*, the Supreme Chief, relinquishing his apostolate among men for the more congenial one among *women*, in whom he professed to discover the most sublime manifestation of the Divinity, began to preach to his devotees, most of whom were married, the doctrine of Mohammedan *polygamy* (1831). This was the beginning of a schism, and

Hosted by Google

Father Rodrigues characterized the teachings of Enfantin as a desertion of the principles of Saint-Simon. Finally, in 1832, when the doctrines of the Saint-Simonians began to give occasion to disturbances among the workingmen of Lyons, their place of meeting was closed, and some of their leaders arrested and punished for misconduct. From this time forth the shame attaching to them was such that they no longer appeared in public. Their writings and works were ridiculed, and most of them abandoned a doctrine which had excited in them only a momentary enthusiasm. The few who remained loyal to their former principles passed over to Egypt to find new fields for energies that had been paralyzed in France. *Mary Reine*, who edited a paper called *La Femme Libre*, now became the leading spirit of the Saint-Simonians, but it would seem that the system did not bring her the comfort and blessings its author promised, for she put an end to her life by casting herself into the Seine, June 29, 1836.

Startled by these alarming symptoms, and possibly desirous to preserve and strengthen its own power and authority, the government of July effected a reconciliation with the Church, and gave particular attention to the subject of education, to which the clergy devoted themselves with zeal and energy.

The congregations most distinguished at this time for their work in the cause of education were the *Brothers of the Christian Schools* and the *Brothers of St. Joseph*.[1] In 1841 there were 2,136 Brothers and 10,371 Sisters of various congregations engaged in teaching in France, in active and successful competition with lay teachers. The congregations will be *separately* treated hereafter.

By and by friendly relations were established between the government and the clergy, and the latter prudently kept aloof from all interference in politics, devoting their strength and energies to the work of their august ministry. They were remarkable for their earnest zeal, their dignified deportment, and irreproachable morals. Their high moral character extorted the praise of even their enemies. To keep alive and nourish the fervor so necessary to the life of a priest, the *French episcopacy*, embracing many worthy and illustrious names, provided for the holding of yearly retreats and other religious exercises specially adapted to this end. *Jansenism* and *Gallicanism*, which had at one time divided the French clergy into hostile camps, now nearly, if not quite, disap-

[1] Cf., on the religious establishments of France, *The Catholic* of 1841, Oct., pp. 1, 19; 1842, Jany., pp. 26–46; March, pp. 231, 254.

Hosted by Google

peared; and the government cheerfully assisted in establishing closer relations between the clergy and the Holy See. Their intellectual culture was promoted by two enterprises of almost simultaneous origin. On the one hand, men like Messrs. *Didot*, *Gaume*, *Caillau*, and *Migne*[1] published and sold at a very trifling price the works of the *Fathers of the Church*, the *principal Catholic commentators on Scripture*, and the *great theologians* and *sacred orators*, thus encouraging the clergy to give their time to ecclesiastical studies; on the other, eminent scholars, such as Cardinal *Gousset*, Bishop *Dupanloup*, *Gerbet*, *Bautain*, *Montalembert*, *Lacordaire*, *Rio*, *Marcel de Serres*, *Blanc*, *Saint-Bonnet*, *Breyme*, *Siguier*, *Védrine*, *Receveur*, *Rohrbacher*, *Glaire*, *Ginouillac*, *Ozanam*, and *Nicolas*,[2] by their labors gave to theology a more speculative tendency and erudite character. Ancient Christian literary treasures, the existence of which was hitherto unknown, were brought to light and published by the Benedictine, Father *Pitra*, in his *Specilegium Solesmense* (1852 et sq., 4 vols., 4to). The *Ami de la Religion*, edited by M. *Picot* († 1840); the *Université Catholique*, the *Union Catholique*, the *Univers*, the *Correspondant*, and other religious journals contributed in their way to inspire the clergy with an ardent and persevering energy. The combined result of all these efforts was the notable progress made by religion, chiefly after the Revolution of 1830, which was only partially retarded by the attempts made to overturn both the civil and religious orders.

Nowhere was the revival of religion more remarkable than in Paris; the churches were well attended at all times, but particularly during the season of Advent and on station-days in Lent. Christian speech was once more heard, even in the *French Academy*, where powerful statesmen like *Molé* and

[1] *Caillau*, Introductio ad SS. Patrum lectionem, Mediolani, 1830, 2 vols. The *Latin*, in 217 vols., 4to, Paris, 1843 sq., and the *Greek* Fathers, in 162 vols., 4to., Paris, 1857 sq, published by *Migne*. For *Exegesis* and *Dogmatics*, Sacrae scripturae et Theologiae cursus completus ex tractatibus omnium perfectissimis ubique (=quacunque gentium.—Tr.) habitis, etc., 56 vols., 4to, Paris, ed. *Migne*. Cfr. *Hurter*, Birth and Regeneration.

[2] *The Catholic* of 1843, May nro., p. 113–137, and Thesaurus libror. rei Catholicae, Würzburg, 1848, under the respective names. *Nicolas*, The Relation of Protestantism and of all Heresies to Socialism; Germ. by *Müller*, Mentz, 1853.

Hosted by Google

Pasquier seemed to take a delight and pride in proclaiming their religious convictions.[1] There was, however, one serious cause of regret. *Higher education* in France was wholly controlled by the *University*, and the *philosophy* taught was *godless and materialistic*. The bishops protested against this *monopoly*, and demanded *freedom of education;* the Catholic press reiterated the same protest and the same demand; Count *Montalembert* made a vigorous speech to the same purpose in the French House of Peers; and *Saint-Foi*, adopting a similar line of argument in his *Livre des peuples et des rois*, showed in eloquent and burning words the terrible consequences of apostasy from God, but all to little purpose.[2] Men who had the cry of liberty incessantly upon their tongues, and were dinning it with wearisome iteration into the ears of other men, refused to grant it in matters where it is most vital that men should be free. Those who shout liberty, fraternity, and equality have always been tyrants, once they got power into their own hands. In the meantime, however, the spirit of faith was kept alive and glowing by pulpit orators like *Rozaven*, *Ravignan*, *Lacordaire*, and *Bautain*, and by numerous and accurate editions of the Holy Scriptures, the Following of Christ, prayer-books, and the works of Bossuet, Fénélon, Massillon, Bourdaloue, and other eminent authors. That it was a living and sustained faith is evident from the contributions made by the French to the support of *Foreign Missions*,[3] greater in amount than the contributions of all other nations for the same purpose put together; from the

[1] *The Catholic*, Mentz, 1841, Febr. nro., Append., p. L. sq. Cf. June nro., Appendix; *ibid.*, Febr. nro. of 1843.

[2] *The Catholic* of 1841 and 1842. Le monopole universitaire, destructeur de la Religion et des Lois, ou la Charte et la liberté de l'enseignement. Lyon, 1843. *Lamartine*, The Freedom of Instruction (*The Catholic*, 1844, nro. 1, Appendix; nro. 10, Appendix, 2; see also nro. 9). *Montalembert*, in the Chamber of Peers (*The Catholic*, May, 1844). *Staudenmaier*, The Chief Point in the Question of Public Instruction in France (*Freiburg Journal* of Theol., Vol. XIII.) *Bonn Review* of Philos. and Theol., new series, year V., nros. 3 and 4.

[3] Annales de la propagation de la foi (Germ. by *Ritter* (*Smets*), publ. at Cologne and Our Lady of Hermits. We mention, besides, L'Oeuvre du Catholicisme en Europe. Cf. Cath. Eccl. Gazette, year 1840, nro. 1, and the *Tübing.* Quart., year 1839, nro. 3, p. 367–381.

Hosted by Google

number and character of the *charitable institutions* which it inspired, among which may be mentioned the Societies of *St. Francis Regis* and of *St. Vincent de Paul* and the *Sunday Schools* for workingmen;[1] from the universal admiration and esteem expressed for the *Sisters of Charity*, under whose charge nearly all the hospitals and central prison-houses of correction were placed;[2] and, finally, from the greater interest in providing for the religious wants of the *Catholic soldiers*, particularly in the colonies, and from the erection of a new *bishopric in Algiers*, a very important step for the future of the Church in that country.

§ 401. *The Catholic Church in Spain.*

On his return to his States, Ferdinand VII. set aside the Constitution of the Cortes (1814), it being hostile to the Church, and restored the ancient order of things. Unfortunately the country was separated into two camps: in the one were the *Apostolicals*, or defenders of the rights of the Church; in the other the *Liberals*, or those professing to be the champions of freedom. The latter gained the day, and on the 7th of March, 1821, forced the king to accept a new Constitution. Two years later there was an uprising of the royalists, and, aided by French intervention, they restored the authority of Ferdinand. It was now the turn of the advocates of the Constitution to have some experience of the persecution they inflicted on others in the day of their power. But the king was by no means ready to adopt all the views of the Apostolicals; like his Bourbon predecessors, he believed the proper form of government was an absolute mon-

[1] Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul, rapport général de l'année 1843, Paris, 1844; conférences de Paris, ibid., 1844. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. X.; *The Catholic*, 1843, Appendix of February number.

[2] According to the *Constitutionnel* of December 14, 1843, there were then in France 1,329 hospitals for the sick and the poor; 6,275 charity-boards, supplying aid to 695,932 persons; the religious congregations of women took care of 1,200,000 sick persons, besides furnishing 10,375 teachers, who had under their charge 620,950 children; the Brothers of Christian Doctrine numbered 2,136, and were educating 150,000 pupils; moreover, they were daily increasing in number. (NOTE OF FRENCH TR.)

Hosted by Google

archy. The Apostolicals were discontented, and meditated his overthrow and the placing of *Don Carlos* upon the throne. This gave rise to troubles in Catalonia, which, however, were soon suppressed.

As time went on, the estrangement between Ferdinand and the Apostolicals became more complete. After the death of Josephine, his third wife, he married his cousin, *Maria Christina*, of Naples, December 11, 1829, through whose influence he abrogated, by a decree of March 29, 1830, the Salic law, excluding females from the throne, which the European powers had forced upon Spain by the Peace of *Utrecht* (1713), to prevent a union by marriage of the French and Spanish crowns. The old Castilian law of succession was thus revived, giving to the king's daughters and grand-daughters a priority of right before his brothers and other collateral lines. On the 10th of October, 1830, an heir was born to the king, who had had no issue by his former marriages, in the person of *Isabella*, who, on the death of her father, September 29, 1833, was proclaimed Queen of Spain. Her mother, Christina, was named regent, and Don Carlos, the brother of the late king, with many of his adherents, was ordered to quit the kingdom. This was the occasion of a fresh civil war, which raged with great violence in Aragon and the Basque Provinces; and the queen-regent, being now entirely in the power of the Liberals, could maintain herself only by making every day new concessions. To add to the general disorder, the cholera broke out in Madrid in 1834, and a rumor was started and sped like fire through the city that the monks had poisoned the wells. A furious mob at once rushed to the monasteries, forcibly entered them, and murdered their peaceful inmates.[1] Every hour added to the confusion, and the spirit of irreligion grew daily more impious and aggressive. The most infamous works that French literature could supply were translated into Spanish, and a fierce and multitudinous clamor was raised against convents and persons of religious profession. By a law of June 25, 1835, nine hun-

[1] Cfr. *Sion*, year 1841, nro. 128, and *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 488 sq.

Hosted by Google

dred convents were suppressed, their property confiscated, and, together with that belonging to the Inquisition, confiscated some time previously, sold to pay the public debt. On the 15th of August, 1835, an insurrection broke out at Madrid; the restoration of the Constitution of 1812 was demanded; and the Deputies repaired to Aranjuez, and required the queen-regent to give her consent to the suppression of the remaining monasteries. By the adroitness of the minister, the measure was for the present delayed, but under *Mendizabal*, his successor, carried into execution, in virtue of a decree of October 11, 1835. By this decree three thousand monasteries, that is, nearly all there were in the kingdom, were suppressed; their books, pictures, art-treasures of every kind, and everything else of value, including the sacred vessels, seized and sold at a price far below their worth, to cover the expenses of the civil war between the *Christinos* or Constitutionalists and the Royalists or *Carlists*.[1] Following the example of the French National Convention, the Cortes, in 1837, abolished tithes, and declared the possessions of the Church national property. A committee was at the same time appointed to draw up a plan for the *reformation and reorganization of the clergy*. It consisted of ecclesiastics of known Jansenistic tendencies and favorable to episcopal independence of the Holy See. They proposed the suppression of seventeen old bishoprics and the erection of five new ones, the closing of eighteen cathedral churches, and the maintenance of worship and the support of the clergy at the public expense. By the Constitution of 1837 (Art. XI.) the government had already pledged itself to provide out of the public treasury for the worship and the priests of the *Catholic* Church, to which the great bulk of the Spanish people belonged.

Desirous to be at once impartial and to consult for the best interests of the Church, *Gregory XVI.* declined, during the continuance of the civil war, either to recognize Queen Isabella or to utter a word against the new order of things. Many of the clergy, however, possessing neither his foresight nor his elevated ideas of justice, declared emphatically in

[1] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., p. 294 sq.; Vol. IV., p. 641 sq., 705 sq.

Hosted by Google

favor of Don Carlos, and as a consequence of their rashness many dioceses remained without pastors; monks and other religious were thrown out of their annuities; and even priests in charge of congregations were reduced to the extremities of want. On the other hand, the government made appointments to archbishoprics, to whom the Holy See declined to grant canonical institution; and, while the question was still in dispute, caused the appointees to be chosen administrators of the dioceses by the respective chapters. During the ministry of Count *Ofalia*, when it finally became evident that something must be done to improve the deplorable condition of the Church, a committee was appointed to deliberate upon the best means of again establishing relations between the Spanish government and the Holy See. *Don Julian Villalba* was sent as envoy to Rome, and besides being very active himself, received also important aid from the French Court in prosecuting the object of his mission. As there were now twenty-two sees vacant in Spain and her dependencies,[1] the necessity was urgent of coming to some understanding immediately.

After the conference at Vergara between *Espartero* and *Maroto* the civil war gradually died out. Worn out by the severe trials through which they had just passed, the Spaniards turned with fresh relish to thoughts of God and His Church. With the return of peace came also a revival of faith and a more assiduous attention to religious duties. Numerous journals were started in the interests of Church and State, of which *La Religion*, *El Catolico*, and *El Profeta* were the best known and most influential. But, unfortunately, fresh troubles and new dangers surrounded the Church after the revolution of 1840, which resulted in the forcible resignation by Queen Christina of her office of regent.

The revolutionary juntas in the provinces were extremely violent in their treatment of ecclesiastics. Bishops were expelled from their dioceses and priests from their parishes, and their places supplied by members of the so-called liberal

[1] Conf. *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of 1840, nros. 27 and 45; also *Augsburg Universal Gazette*, year 1840, nro. 222.

Hosted by Google

clergy. The junta of Madrid even went the length of suspending the Assessors of the Ecclesiastical Tribunal (*Rota de la Nunciatura Apostolica*), established March 26, 1771, during the pontificate of Clement XIV. *Ramirez de Arellano*, the Papal Nuncio, was conducted across the frontier by order of the provisional government of Espartero, December 29, 1840, because he protested in the name of the Holy See against these acts of violence and all infringements of the rights of the Church. On the 1st of February, 1836, the *Holy Father*, Gregory XVI., delivered an *allocution*, and *another* on the 1st of March, 1841, in both of which he protested solemnly before God against the outrages heaped upon the Church by the Spanish government, which had now grown more fiercely hostile than ever to the Court of Rome.[1]

In reply to the second allocution of the Pope, the Spanish revolutionary government published a manifesto, bearing date of July 30, shamelessly misrepresenting the character of the papal document, which was purely religious, and professing to regard it as a *declaration of war*, emanating, not from the Head of the Church, but from the temporal ruler of Rome, and on this account offensive to the Spanish people, who were not prepared to remain quiet under such gratuitous insults. Accordingly, such of the ecclesiastics as attempted to spread the allocution were severely punished. Finally, as if to make the bondage of the Church complete and irrevocable, *Alonso*, Minister of Justice and Grace, renewed the oft-tried experiment *of severing the bonds uniting Head and members* by forcibly putting bishops appointed by government in possession of sees without the authorization of Rome. But against this assumption of spiritual power even the liberal bishops themselves protested, and were in consequence deposed, and expiated in exile the penalty of their boldness. Gregory XVI. now addressed an encyclical letter to the whole Church, call-

[1] *Sion*, year 1841, March, nro. 31; the answer of the Spanish minister, *ibid.*, August, nro. 98, Appendix. Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., p. 467–471. The preliminary ordinance of the Spanish government, dated July 28, referring to the allocution, is found in *Sion*, July, nro. 84. Concerning the sale of clerical property, see *Sion*, 1841, August, nro. 108, Appendix, and September, nro. 118, Appendix.

Hosted by Google

ing upon the faithful *to offer public prayers for the welfare of the Church in Spain.*[1] All Christendom cheerfully responded to the summons of the Holy Father, and though borne down with sorrow that evils so great should afflict the venerable Church of Spain, was not without hope that a nation, which had been distinguished of old for its ardent piety, had triumphed over Islamism and repelled Protestantism from its borders, would come safe out of its present dangers, cast off the blight of infidelity, and be as glorious in the future as it had been in the past. And, in matter of fact, there were signs plainly indicating that these prayers were not without effect. Sees were filled with bishops possessed of apostolic courage, and writers of eminent ability, like *Balmès*[2] (b. 1810, d. 1848), and great Christian statesmen, like *Donoso Cortes*, Marquis de Valdegamas (b. May 6, 1809, d. May 3, 1853),[3]

[1] The Latin text is given in the April number of *The Catholic* of 1842, supplement. pp. XVI. sq. The Spanish also attempted to prevent the execution of this encyclical.

[2] The principal of the numerous works of Rev. *B. Jaime Balmes*, a writer equally great as a statesman, philosopher, and theologian, which have been often republished and translated into French, German, English, Italian, etc., are: Observaciones sociales, politicas y economicas sobre los bienos del clero, written about 1837 against sacrilegious confiscation; Consideraciones sobre la situacion de España, directed chiefly against Espartero; El Protestantismo comparado con el Catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilizacion europea (Barcelona, 1842–1844; Paris, 1844–1853; Engl. tr., Baltimore, 1851), which established his fame beyond the Pyrenees; Cartas a un esceptico, i. e. Letters to a Sceptic; La religion demostrada ad alcance de los niños, which is a very popular catechism; El Criterio; Filosofia fundamental, 4 vols., Barcelona, 1846, his chief work, translated into English by H. F. Brownson, 2 vols., New York, 1857; Filosofia elemental, a practical text-book, tr. into Latin by the author himself; Escritos politicos, in a strong 4to vol., published after his death; the periodicals La Civilizacion, later on merged in the Sociedad; El Pensamiento de la Nacion, and the pamphlet "Pio IX." This model priest and modern teacher of the Spanish nation, deeply imbued with the spirit of St. Thomas, had a square named after him and a statue erected to his memory at *Vich*, his native city. (Tr.)

[3] *Donoso Cortés*, in the most famous of his works, Essai sur le Catholicisme, le libéralisme et le socialisme (Paris, 1851), maintains that Catholic theology is the proper basis of politics. Of his other writings, we may mention Consideraciones sobre la diplomacia, y su influencia en el estado politico y social de Europa (Madrid 1834); La ley electoral, considerada en su base y en su relacion con el espiritu de nuestras instituciones (1835); and a collection of his speeches

Hosted by Google

began to take their place among the champions of the Church. "We feel assured," said the organs of the better class of the people, "that the Church, in emerging from these difficulties, will have gained immensely. You cry freedom," they said, addressing their opponents, "and you do well. Freedom is what we demand both for ourselves and for the Church. The Catholic religion is a sacred law, engraven upon the tablets of our national liberties. In our faith and its divine power we will seek the strength necessary to enable us to persevere in the work of maintaining our independence, against the horrors of which we are now the witnesses." "Look to it," they added, appealing to the younger clergy, "look to it, you of the rising generation of priests, for the age is in your keeping, since it is the duty of youth in seasons of convulsion to hand on to the future the sacred traditions of the past. And as the hopes of the future are centered in you, learn wisdom at the foot of the Crucifix, that under the protection of a faith ever old and ever new, peace and happiness may again rest upon our common country."

The persecutors were soon overtaken in their career of iniquity. The ministry were overthrown; Espartero banished; and *Isabella II.*, declared of age, called to take the reins of government into her own hands (Nov. 10, 1843). The new administration signalized its accession to power by some acts of justice to the Church. Bishops were recalled from exile, the restrictions on the exercise of their authority removed,[1] and the *Rota de la Nunciatura Apostolica* again established, but no steps were taken to restore the confiscated property of the Church. After many and tedious negotiations, the queen finally announced, at the opening of the Cortes in December, 1848, that relations with the Holy See were once more established and all ecclesiastical matters satisfactorily adjusted.

---

and early writings (1849–1850). A complete Spanish edition of his works was published after his death at Madrid, and the same appeared in a French dress at Paris in 1859. (Tr.)

[1] See *The Catholic* of 1844, nro. 15, and *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIV., p. 209 sq.

Hosted by Google

§ 402. *The Catholic Church in Portugal.*

On the death of *Maria*, March 26, 1816, her son, *John VI.*, succeeded to the crown of Portugal. Being then in Brazil, whither he had gone after the expulsion of the French from Portugal, he intrusted the government of his European dominions conjointly to Lord Beresford and the Patriarch of Lisbon. The country being in the meantime occupied by the English, the Portuguese rose in rebellion against the rule of strangers, and at Lisbon and Oporto demanded their removal and the formation of juntas (1820). The Cortes were convoked, and proclaimed a constitution still more democratic in character than that already adopted in Spain. To this constitution John VI., who had finally concluded to visit his European possessions, was forced to swear fidelity, October 1, 1822, after his arrival at Lisbon. When, however, the government of the Cortes was overthrown in Spain, a similar reaction against the constitution took place in Portugal. *Queen Carlotta*, a sister to Ferdinand VII., and Prince *Dom Miguel*, labored strenuously for the restoration of royal authority, and in consequence of an uprising, which took place May 27, 1823, and was participated in by both the people and the army, the king was enabled to abrogate the constitution. Knowing the weakness and indecision of his father, Dom Miguel now headed a rebellion against him, but being defeated April 23, 1824, was, together with his mother, expelled the kingdom. John VI. died March 10, 1826. The heir presumptive to the throne was his eldest son, *Dom Pedro*, who, having remained in Brazil after the departure of the royal family for Spain, had proclaimed that country an independent empire in 1822, and assumed the title of *Emperor of Brazil.* Unable at once to take the direction of affairs in Portugal, he intrusted the government of that country to his daughter, *Doña Maria da Gloria*, then in her seventeenth year, with his sister, Isabella Maria, as regent, who was compelled to accept a charter modeled upon that of France. The hand of the Infanta was offered by her father, Dom Pedro, to Dom Miguel, who was appointed regent July 3, 1827, and took the oath to

Hosted by Google

maintain the constitution February 26, 1828. Dom Miguel now aspired to the throne, and, after defeating the garrison of Oporto and others that remained loyal to Dom Pedro, and imprisoning or exiling such of the deputies as he foresaw would oppose his pretensions, convoked the Cortes, and was proclaimed king by that body June 25, 1828. To consolidate his power, he had recourse to the most arbitrary measures, and his government was so despotic that the liberal party rose in revolt against it. This was the commencement of a war that lasted through the years 1832, 1833, and 1834, between Dom Miguel and his elder brother, Dom Pedro I., who, having abdicated the imperial throne of Brazil in 1831, sailed in June, 1832, for Portugal, with a fleet and a considerable body of troops, collected on the island of Terceira, one of the Azores, to make good the claim of his daughter to the throne of Portugal.

Dom Miguel, having defended the rights of the Church against the Cortes and opposed the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, had the sympathies of both clergy and people. *Dom Pedro*, on the other hand, proclaimed himself the champion of freedom and the vindicator of his daughter's right to the throne, and, with the aid of the French and English, was victorious in the struggle. Abandoned by the bulk of his followers, and seeing the hopelessness of longer continuing the conflict, Dom Miguel signed the Convention of Evora on May 3, 1834, by which he resigned all pretensions to the crown, and agreed to quit Portugal. He went first to Genoa, thence to Rome, and subsequently passed several years in London. In 1851 he married the German Princess Loewenstein, by whom he had one son, Miguel, born in 1853, and four daughters. He died November 14, 1866, at Wertheim, in the Grand Duchy of Baden.

The Church in Portugal seemed now to be again passing through the disastrous *days of Pombal*. By a decree of August 5, 1833, Dom Pedro declared all bishoprics vacant to which appointments had been made by the Holy See on the presentation of Dom Miguel; and by another of May 28, 1834, the Religious and Military Orders were suppressed, their hospitals closed, and their property confiscated; tithes

Hosted by Google

were abolished, and the parish-priests, to whom the government refused to pay the promised salaries, were reduced to utter destitution, and forced to subsist upon the charity of the faithful. By an *allocution* of August 1, 1834, the Pope, after deploring the sad condition of religious affairs in Portugal, threatened with the censures, pronounced by the Council of Trent against the spoilers of the Church, all who violated the ecclesiastical liberties and interfered with the free exercise of spiritual authority.[1] His words, however, did not deter the Patriarch of Lisbon from consecrating the bishops appointed by Dom Pedro.

Dom Pedro died September 24, 1834, and after the accession of his daughter, *Doña Maria da Gloria*, to the throne, the government passed almost completely under English influence. A new constitution was proclaimed, which, though it was only indifferently received by the people, contributed largely to complicate the religious difficulties of Portugal. Quite a numerous party refused to acknowledge as lawful bishops those appointed by Dom Pedro, without the authorization of the Sovereign Pontiff. Negotiations were opened at Lisbon in 1841 between the Holy See and the Portuguese Court, through the internuncio, *Cappacini*, by whose ability and address amicable relations were again restored. As a preliminary condition to a future concordat, Cappacini was obliged to relinquish the Church's claim to the property formerly belonging to the Religious Orders. On the 3d of April, 1843, the papal confirmation was obtained for the appointments made by the queen, viz., the Patriarch of Lisbon, the Archbishop of Braga, and the Bishop of Leiria, the others being held over for future consideration by Cappacini.[2] Everything now seemed to indicate that the conclusion of the concordat was not far off; but, notwithstanding the prudence and conciliatory temper displayed by both the Holy Father and his internuncios, final action was indefinitely deferred, and this unsatisfactory state of affairs endures to the present day. On the death of the queen, on the 15th of

[1] The Latin original is in *The Catholic*, 1834, Oct., Supplem., p. VIII. sq.

[2] Augsburg *Univ. Gazette*, 1843, nro. 127. *Ibid.*, nro. 37, 1844, Supplem.

Hosted by Google

November, 1853, Dom Pedro succeeded to the throne, under the regency of his father, the king-consort, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, who governed the kingdom until the expiration of the prince's minority, on September 15, 1855. He appears to have exercised his authority with prudence and discretion, and since his time the royal family has been steadily growing in public favor, and on the whole the condition of the country is now more promising. The death of the young king and his brother John, in 1861, seems to have evoked feelings of loyalty and sympathy throughout the nation, and the present sovereign, Louis I., second son of Doña Maria, was proclaimed amid universal expressions of attachment to the reigning dynasty. Still, owing to the intolerant spirit of the liberal party, whose leaders are at the head of the government, there has been no material improvement in the affairs of the Church.

§ 403. *The New Birth of the Church in Great Britain and Ireland.* (Cf. § 329.)

† Discussion amicale sur l'église anglicane et en général sur la Réforme, dediée au clergé de toutes les communions protestantes, redigée en forme de lettres, par M. l'évêque de Strasbourg (le Pape de Trévern); 4th edition, Paris, 1835, 2 vols. Cfr. † *Weber*, State of Religion in England. *Pletz*, New Theolog. Review, year XIII., nro. 4. *Scharpff*, nro. 2, p. 251–291. Organization of the Catholic Church in England (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. LIII., year 1864, in five articles). *R. Murray*, Ireland and her Church, London, 1848. *Shea*, The Irish Church, London, 1852. *De Beaumont*, L'Irlande, Paris, 1839. See "The Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell," by his son, *John O'Connell*, M. P. (2 vols., London, 1846). "The Liberator, his Life and Times," by *L. F. Cusack* (London, 1872). Abbé *Perraud*, Etudes sur l'Irlande contemporaine (Paris, 1862).

As has been seen, the oppressive laws restricting the liberties of the Catholics of Great Britain, and notably of *Ireland*, began to be somewhat relaxed about the time of the French Revolution, which drove numerous priests beyond the Channel,[1] whose piety, ability, and learning largely contributed to

[1] During the months of September and October, 1792, 6,000 priests arrived in England, and the number was soon increased to 8,000. The palace of Winchester was placed at their disposal by the royal family, and there 660 of them were most hospitably entertained. A subscription for them was started in the

Hosted by Google

correct a host of prejudices. Previously to this time, however, their yoke was rendered more easy and endurable by the circumstances attending the breaking out of the War of Independence in the United States, and the loss to England of her colonies in that country.

By request of George III., the Irish Parliament passed the Relief Act of 1793, granting a few concessions to the Catholics of Ireland. They were now permitted to freely assist at divine service in their own churches; exempted from the penalties for non-attendance at the worship of the Established Church on Sundays; granted freedom of franchise in municipal and parliamentary elections; and allowed to hold a few of the less important civil and military offices.[1] From the higher offices they were still excluded, and in the following year the Catholics of Dublin made another demand for the removal of their remaining disabilities. At the same time a Protestant revolutionary party, known as the United Irishmen, was formed, into which many Catholics entered, either compelled by force or in the belief that through its agency they would soon obtain their civil rights. The Rebellion broke out in 1798, and resulted in the loss to Ireland of her political independence. The Union was effected in 1801, and Ireland has been ever since united to England. After many fruitless attempts to emancipate themselves from their disabilities, the most important of which was the one that ended so disastrously to *Robert Emmet* in 1803, the Catholics of Ireland finally, in 1809, accepted the leadership of *Daniel O'Connell*, by whose courage, perseverance, skill, and ability the people, while remaining within the strict letter of the law, were kept in a perpetual state of agitation. While O'Connell desired nothing more ardently than the social, political, and religious amelioration of Ireland, he laid it down as a principle that this was to be obtained without the shedding of a single drop of blood.[2] "*Catholic Committees*" were appointed

month of September, 1793, and the sum of £67,000 raised, which was ample for the support of 4,800 of the refugees.

[1] *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland, Vol. II., p. 354. (Tr.)

[2] *Wyse*, Hist. of the Cath. Association, London, 1829, 2 vols. *Baumstark*, D. O'Connell, Freiburg, 1873.

Hosted by Google

and meetings held all over the Island, the avowed purpose of which was to emancipate Catholics from the disabilities under which they lay and to repeal the Act of Union. The outrages perpetrated by Orangemen served to stimulate the zeal of the agitators. For more than twenty years the subject of emancipation had been uppermost in the minds of Catholics, and in the interval the bills introduced into the English Houses of Parliament for the purpose of abolishing the disqualifying statutes had been uniformly thrown out.[1] And now that there seemed a fairer opportunity than ever before of having a relief bill passed, it was again temporarily postponed by the controversy between the Catholics of England and Ireland on the question of giving the Crown the power of *veto* in the appointment of bishops, because on the solution of this question the passage of the bill depended. The *Catholic Committees* were suppressed by government in 1814, but the *Catholic Association*, having precisely the same object in view, was started in 1823 by Mr. O'Connell, assisted by Mr. Shiel. This was in its turn declared illegal by Parliament in 1825, and was in consequence dissolved, but only to be replaced by another of the same character, under the name of an *Association for Instruction*.[2] Meetings were held in every province, and petitions drafted and presented to Parliament. These associations were useful in bringing the claims of the Irish Catholics, nearly all of whom were members of them, before the world, and thus pressing them upon the consideration of the government. In consequence, a Relief Bill was introduced in the House of Commons in March, 1826, and passed that body by a respectable majority. In the House of Lords, however, it met with a most decided and stubborn resistance, which Mr. Bright[3] characterizes as "verging upon the unconstitutional," and was rejected chiefly through the

[1] As early as 1812, Mr. Canning had supported the relief bill brought in by Mr. Grattan. It passed the House of Commons by a vote of 255 to 106, but was lost in the House of Lords, the vote standing 126 to 125. (Tr.)

[2] *Baumstark*, l. c., pp. 66 sq.

[3] *Rev. J. Franck Bright*, English History, London, 1877, Period III., pp. 1390, 1391. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

efforts of the Duke of York, by a majority of forty-eight. The matter was brought to a crisis by the return of Mr. O'Connell, now styled the *Liberator*, as member of Parliament for Clare, in 1828. During the ministry of Mr. Canning, who was known to be favorable to Catholic Emancipation, the excitement in Ireland had somewhat subsided; but when the Duke of Wellington was called to the Premiership his undisguised hostility to the measure again revived the agitation. It now became evident to both the Premier and his colleague in the ministry, Sir Robert Peel, that they must take their choice between a civil war and the emancipation of the Catholics. After overcoming the difficulty of obtaining the king's consent to the measure, Mr. Peel introduced the bill in the House of Commons, March 5, 1829, where it was finally passed by a vote of 315 to 137. It passed the House of Lords April 10, by a vote of 213 to 209, and was signed by the king, after some vain and childish attempts to deny that he had freely authorized his minister to bring it in, on the following 13th of April, and now the Catholics, both in England and Ireland, were once more in the enjoyment of very nearly all the rights possessed by their Protestant neighbors.[1] By this bill a new oath, which Catholics might consistently take, was substituted for the old test oath;[2] and Catholics were qualified to sit in either House of Parliament, and to hold all civil, military, and municipal offices, with a few important exceptions.[2] The Catholics of these countries, said *Lord John Russell*, felt in 1829 very like the early Christians when they came forth from the Catacombs. This *first* concession,

[1] By this bill Catholics were "eligible to all offices, civil, military, or municipal, with the exception of the office of Regent, of Lord Chancellor, of Viceroy of Ireland, or Royal Commissioner of the General Assembly of Scotland." *Bright*, l. c., Period III., pp. 1402 sq. (Tr.) Very complete accounts of the various phases of Catholic Emancipation in Ireland, from 1824 to 1829, are found in *The Catholic* of Mentz, year 1825, Vol. XVI., Supplem. to June number; Vol. XVII., p. 176 sq., year 1829; Vol. XXXII., p. 201 sq., p. 330 sq., together with *Sir Robert Peel's* Speech, unabridged. *Robiano*, T. IV., p. 176–200. *Theiner*, Collection of Some Important Documents bearing on the History of Catholic Emancipation in England, Mentz, 1835.

[2] This oath was repealed in 1867, and one still more acceptable substituted. *Killen*, l. c., Vol. II., p. 434, note. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

which a Protestant government had very reluctantly granted, proved quite insufficient to satisfy the demands of the Catholics of Ireland, who, as Lord *Russell* said in his place in Parliament, had been removed from an underground prison only to be placed in one above ground. Was it reasonable to expect them to be satisfied when 700,000 Anglicans, or about one-tenth of the population, were still in possession of all the property, which in early times had been set apart by the generous liberality of the Catholic faithful for the support of churches, convents, hospitals, and colleges? Nay, more, when Catholics were forced to pay to the clergy of the Established Church *tithes* on all their lands produced, and when two thousand parsons, some of whom had not a single soul under their charge, divided among them a yearly revenue thus accumulated, amounting to three millions of pounds sterling?[1] The result was that in 1831 a *general movement* was set on foot *against the payment of tithes.* Though persistently claimed, they were stubbornly refused, and, when collected at all, their collection was accompanied by so much litigation, and not unfrequently by such shocking scenes of bloodshed, that the profit derived scarcely compensated for the cost and danger of collection.

During the course of these public events the enthusiasm of the Irish people for the faith of their fathers was steadily on the increase, and their patriotic feelings partook of the nature of transport when O'Connell began to agitate for the *repeal of the Union.* By the government their patriotic demonstrations were denounced as calculated to foment hatred and incite to rebellion. In 1843 the agitation for the repeal of the Union was at its height, monster meetings were held in every part of the country, and preparations were being made for one of unusual magnitude, to take place at *Clontarf* on Sunday, October 8, when instructions were received from

[1] In the county of Kilkenny, in the south of Ireland, there were 380,000 Catholics and 1,000 Anglicans; still the former were forced to pay an Anglican bishop and sixty-four ministers a sum which made their income, in *legal tithes*, equal to *six times* that received by the Catholic clergy through voluntary contributions. (*The Catholic*, 1831, Vol. XLI., pp. 57–81; *Cologne Gazette*, June 23, 1843.)

Hosted by Google

government forbidding it. In 1844, O'Connell, with some of his colleagues, was tried by a jury of twelve Protestants from Dublin, found guilty of seditious conspiracy, fined £2,000, sentenced to two years' imprisonment, and put under bonds to keep the peace for a period of seven years. Even fair-minded Englishmen regarded the sentence as unjust, and it was in consequence reversed by the English House of Lords.[1] Not long after these events O'Connell's health began to break, and being advised to try a milder climate, he set off in the spring of 1847 for Italy, but got no farther than Genoa, where he was taken with paralysis, and died on the 15th of May of the same year.

It may seem strange that Catholics and Catholic institutions were as heartily despised and as fiercely proscribed in *England*, whose special boast is that she is pre-eminently the land of political freedom, as they were even in Ireland. Two circumstances will in a measure account for this condition of things. On the one hand, the Catholics in England were too few in number and too destitute of wealth and influence to provide organs for bringing their claims before the public in any effective way; and, on the other, their political debasement had been such as to render them more indifferent than the Catholics of other countries to the interests of religion. From the days of Henry VIII. to the date of the Emancipation Bill the *Catholic press* had been muzzled, or had ceased to exist, and Catholics themselves had been shut out from public life by civil disabilities. They were therefore the victims at once of political proscription and of the unjust prejudices accumulated through centuries of ignorance. Hence, when the press became again free, and the teachings and institutions of the Roman Catholic Church were once more made the subject of public and daily discussion, prejudices began to wear away, and juster judgments and more kindly feelings to prevail. To the influence of the press is undoubtedly to be ascribed that remarkable movement in favor of the Church of Rome, which set in above forty years ago and continues to our own day.

[1] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII. †*Rintel*, O'Connell's Trial, Münster, 1845.

Hosted by Google

Previously to this time, however, the apologist, *Gother*,[1] and *Challoner*,[2] Vicar-Apostolic of London, from 1758 to 1781, dissipated by their numerous writings, at least among honest and fair-minded men, the prejudices current against Catholics. The Catholic cause was also ably and zealously defended by *Alban Butler*, the author of the *Lives of the Saints;* by *John Milner*,[3] Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District, from 1803 to 1828; by *Baines* and *Fletcher;* *Howard* and *Berington*; and *Kirk* and *Coombe*. *William Cobbett*, the author of the *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*, possessing a thorough and extensive knowledge of the facts of which he was treating, exposed with consummate skill and great vivacity of style the vulnerable side of Protestantism, and denounced before all Europe, in strong and energetic language, the wrongs which Catholics had been made to endure. *Mr. Robert Charles Dallas*, an Anglican, in a work entitled *The New Conspiracy against the Jesuits* (1815), warmly defended that body against the calumnies put in circulation against them.

Rev. *John Lingard* († 1851), the eminent writer and scholar,

[1] *J. Gother*, The Papist Misrepresented and Represented, Cincinnati, 1 vol.

[2] Bishop *Challoner's* edition of the Holy Bible, 5 vols., 12mo, ed. 1750, superseded the Douai edition; reprinted, New York, 1870. His "Think Well On't," "Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine," "History of the Protestant Religion," "Catholic Christian Instructed," "Meditations," "Lives of the Fathers of the Desert," "Garden of the Soul, a Manual of Prayers," and his translations of "The Following of Christ" and "The Introduction to a Devout Life," have been reprinted frequently in England, Ireland, and America. His "Memoirs of the Missionary Priests," etc., has been several times reprinted. Among his other works were "Britannia Sancta" (2 vols., 4to), "Unerring Authority of the Cath. Church," "British Martyrology," and a "Caveat against the Methodists." (Tr.)

[3] Bishop *Jno. Milner* wrote "Letters to a Prebendary," Dr. Sturges (1800); "End of Religious Controversy" (1818); "Correspondence between a Society of Protestants and Some Catholic Divines." *E. Baines* († 1843), Defense of the Christian Religion, London, 1825. *J. Fletcher*, "The Guide to the True Religion," "Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches," "Difficulties of Protestantism," "Reflections on the Spirit of Religious Controversy," "Vindication of the Catholic Faith." *Howard*, Remarks on the Erroneous Notions Entertained Respective of the Catholic Religion. *Coombe*, Essence of Religious Controversy. *Jos. Berington* († 1827), with Dr. *Kirk* († 1851), published in 1813 "The Faith of Catholics."

Hosted by Google

published a History of England, in which depth of research, impartiality of treatment, and independence of judgment are so conspicuous as to render his statements nearly if not quite unassailable.[1] Lord *Macaulay*, though a Protestant, wrote in a spirit of fairness of the Catholic Church. *Lanigan*, Librarian to the Irish Historical Society, published an ecclesiastical history of Ireland down to the thirteenth century; *John McHale*, the present Archbishop of Tuam, published in 1827 the *Evidences and Doctrines of the Catholic Religion*, which was almost immediately translated into French and German; *Thomas Moore*, the friend of Lord Byron, wrote the *Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion*, which appeared in 1833; Cardinal *Wiseman* († 1865)[2] gave to the world, in language at once eloquent and popular, a clear and methodical exposition of Catholic doctrine and worship; and Miss *Agnew*, through her celebrated novel, entitled *Geraldine*,[3] was instrumental in attracting many souls to the Catholic Church. *Sir Kenelm Henry Digby*, a convert to Catholicity, after long and laborious archaeological studies in the various countries of Europe, published the result of his researches anonymously in London, in three volumes, between the years 1844 and 1847, under the title of *Mores Catholici*, or *Ages of Faith*, a work in which he shows the progress made by the Catholic Church in science, art, and civilization during the Middle Ages. In 1851 the same author published a second work, in six volumes, entitled the *Compitum;* or, the *Meeting of the Ways at the Catholic Church*. The part taken by *periodical lit-*

[1] Life of *Dr. Lingard*, *Bonn Review*, nro. 9, pp. 100–115.

[2] Horae Syriacae (publ. 1828), Sterility of Protestant Missions (Ital.), Rome, 1831. Lectures on the Connection of Science and Revealed Religion (2 vols., 1836); Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church (2 vols., 1836); The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Eucharist (1836); Four Lectures on the Ceremonies of Holy Week (1839); Essays on Various Subjects (3 vols., 1853); Fabiola, or the Church of the Catacombs (1855); Recollections of the Last Four Popes (1858); Sermons (2 vols., 1864); Daily Meditations, Dublin, 1868, etc.

[3] *Geraldine*, or the History of the Guidance of a Soul, London, 1837, directed against the errors attributed to the Catholic Church and the insults heaped upon her ministers, in the *Abbot* of Sir Walter Scott and in Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer's *Devereux*.

Hosted by Google

erature in this movement and its influence in leading men's minds back to ideas so long and so rigorously proscribed was both considerable and important. Among the best known and most serviceable of these publications were the *Catholic Magazine* and *Tablet*, the latter edited by Mr. Lucas, formerly a Quaker. The London Catholic *Tract Society* also contributed largely to the progress of the movement, which received a fresh stimulus from the publication, in the year 1826, of the *Declaration* of the Vicars-Apostolic and their Coadjutors,[1] who at that time governed the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain with episcopal authority. This important document, which consists of eleven articles, gives a scholarly and forcible exposition of the doctrines most frequently and most warmly assailed by Protestants. Beginning with a general statement of the doctrine of the Catholic Church, it treats successively of the Holy Scripture, of the charge of idolatry and superstition, of confession, of indulgences, of civil allegiance, and of obedience to the Pope, closing with these words: "We have endeavored in the foregoing articles to set forth in a straightforward way those doctrines of our Church which in this country are most likely to be misunderstood and misrepresented; we hope, therefore, that our countrymen will receive both our declaration and our explanations in the spirit of truth and charity, and that those who have been hitherto either ignorant or misinformed as to what we believe will now do us the justice to acknowledge that as *Catholics* we hold no religious principles nor ideas not perfectly consistent with our duties as Christians and British subjects."[2]

The activity displayed by Catholic authors and Catholic priests called forth renewed efforts in all ranks of society to forward the interests of the old Church, and the number of *converts from Anglicanism was daily on the increase.*[3]

[1] *Bonn Review*, nro. 17, pp. 203–222; Latin text in *Braun*, Bibliotheca regular. fid., T. I., p. 326.

[2] Not having the English text at hand, we have been obliged to translate from the German and French. (Tr.)

[3] Of the many beautiful writings of this kind, special mention should be made of Dr. *Sibthorp's* "My Return to Catholicity;" Germ., by *Willmann*, Ratisbon, 1843.

Hosted by Google

Ancient and distinctly Catholic institutions, such as convents of females, began to spring up. As early as 1794 French refugee nuns established themselves in England; a colony of Benedictine nuns from Brussels settled at Winchester, and others of Augustinian nuns from Louvain and Bruges came to reside at London and Hammersmith.[1] In 1838 a Catholic Institute was founded in London under the presidency of the Earl of *Shrewsbury*, with affiliated branches in other cities. About the same time a society of ladies was formed under the direction of the Marchioness of *Wellesly* for supplying poor chapels with vestments, altar furniture, and sacred vessels.[2] Within the limits of London there were eleven associations for providing free schools and four for serving and relieving the destitute sick. *Churches* and *chapels* also sprung up. The Catholics of London built a handsome pro-cathedral, while those of York put up a magnificent structure just opposite the famous old minster of that city.[3] The *Catholic population* of England soon increased to above two millions. Even in the Protestant *University of Oxford*, particularly in the College to which Dr. *Pusey* was attached, a strong *tendency* set in toward the Church of Rome.[4] After the year 1843 a large number of Puseyites, among whom were many Anglican clergymen, became converts to Catholicity. Of these the most distinguished was the celebrated Dr. *Newman*,[5] who, in 1848,

[1] *Eccl. Gazette*, by *Hoenighaus*, year 1838, nro. 31. Cfr. nro. 91.

[2] The Marchioness of Wellesly was a grand-daughter of *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, one of the signers of the Declaration of American Independence. (Tr.)

[3] Augsburg *Univ. Gazette*, nro. 147, May 27, 1842.

[4] On the recent Catholic movement in England, which has been hailed with such joy by the public press, and on the part taken in it by Gregory XVI., cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., pp. 688–701; Vol. IX., pp. 65–79; on Puseyism, in particular, Vol. X., pp. 693–696, and Vol. XI., pp. 329 sq. In consequence of a sermon entitled *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, preached at Oxford in 1843, Dr. Pusey was suspended, and in self-defense appealed to the teaching of Anglican divines. This sermon was published in German, together with an *Introduction* on the present state of Anglicanism, by † *Willmann*, Ratisbon, 1844. *J. Gordon*, Du Mouvement Religieux en Angleterre, Par. 1844. The *same*, Conversion de cent cinquante ministres anglicains.

[5] A catalogue of the works of Dr. Newman is given in the *Characteristics of the Writings of John Henry Newman*, by *W. S. Lilly*, New York, 1875. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

founded a house of the Congregation of the Oratory at Birmingham. The influence of the reaction in favor of Catholicity was also felt among the sect of Scotch Presbyterians, founded by *Edward Irving* († 1834), whose followers claimed to enjoy the *gift of tongues* (γλώσσαις λαλεῖν),[1] and whose teachings found an able and eloquent defender in *Thiersch*, a professor of theology at Marburg, in Germany. The English also took up the cause of education with zeal. After the suppression of the English Colleges of St. Omer and of Douai by the French infidels, their professors passed over to England and opened the Colleges of St. Edmund, at Crook Hall, and St. Cuthbert, at Ushaw. The Jesuit College of Stonyhurst and that of St. Mary's, near Birmingham, both of which were granted the privileges of university colleges by the queen, had a similar origin.[2] The universal interest excited throughout Europe by the religious movement in England created a desire to see the people of that country once more enter the fold of Christ. While Cardinal (then Doctor) Wiseman was giving assurances at Rome that the more intelligent of the English people were laying aside their prejudices against the Catholic Church, Lord *Spencer* was going up and down France asking prayers for the conversion of his countrymen,[3] an object for which *Saint Paul of the Cross* had prayed unceasingly for fifty years. To hasten the consummation of so glorious an event, Gregory XVI., on the 11th of May, 1840, subdivided the four *districts* previously existing into *eight*, and Pius IX., by the bull *Universalis Ecclesiae*, dated September 29, 1850, restored the Catholic hierarchy to England. Between the years 1840 and 1852, ninety-two members of the University of Oxford and forty-three of the University of Cambridge entered the Catholic Church. Of the former, sixty-three were clergymen, and of the latter nineteen.

In *Scotland*, where the faith had never grown quite extinct, there began to be now signs of returning life. There were

[1]* *Joerg*, Hist. of Protestantism in the Latest Phases of its Development, Vol. II., pp. 77–203.

[2] *Eccl. Gazette*, 1840, nros. 29 and 32. Cf. nro. 9 of same year and nro. 89 of the year 1839.

[3] Cf. *Sion*, 1840, nro. 23, Supplem. 4.

Hosted by Google

in that country only fifty-one churches in 1829. This number was increased to sixty-eight in 1839, and in 1848 to eighty-seven. A great Catholic Association was formed at *Edinburgh;* the *Catholic Review*, the *Catholic Magazine*, and the *Penny Orthodox Journal* were started to instruct the people; and public discussions were held, which went a great way in neutralizing the efforts of Protestant ministers to misrepresent the teachings of the Catholic Church, and to excite in those who were ignorant of the doctrines so vehemently assailed a desire to know their true character. Catholic higher education in Scotland was chiefly conducted by the clerical professors at the College of St. Mary's, at Blairs. At the opening of this century the Catholic population was about 13,000, and at the present time it is over 400,000, and is steadily growing, the increase being chiefly due to immigration from Ireland.

Ireland, with close upon seven millions of Catholics and a hierarchy consisting of four archbishops and twenty-two bishops,[1] still continued under her great leader, *Daniel O'Connell*,[2] the struggle she had entered upon under the celebrated legal and parliamentary orators, *Curran* († 1817)[3] and *Grattan*[4] († 1820), battling unceasingly for political and religious freedom. The efforts of Mr. O'Connell were well seconded by many churchmen of piety, energy, and learning, of whom the most able were *Dr. Doyle*,[5] Bishop of Kildare († June 15, 1834), a strenuous advocate of Emancipation, a forcible writer, and a distinguished professor of Carlow College; *Thomas Kelly*, Archbishop of Tuam († January 14, 1834), and his successor, *John McHale*, who, over the signature of *Hierophilus*,

[1] This was the number in 1806. (Tr.)

[2] *Eccl. Gazette*, 1840, nro. 52. Cf. *Journal of Literary Amusement*, November, 1839.

[3] *John Philpot Curran's* fame rests mainly on his speeches in behalf of the accused in the State trials, then so numerous. His life was published by his son, *W. H. Curran*, in 1819. (Tr.)

[4] The *Life and Times* of Henry Grattan were published by his son in the form of Memoirs, 4 vols., London, 1842. Cf. *Augsb. Gazette*, Supplem., May 18, 1842, and, for more general information, the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., pp. 736–751.

[5] See *Bonn Review*, nro. 9; *The Catholic*, 1825, Vol. XVII., pp. 1–17.

Hosted by Google

wrote some clever controversial letters on the subject of Emancipation; and *Thomas Moore* († 1834), whose *Irish Melodies* contributed powerfully to evoke feelings of patriotic enthusiasm among the people of Ireland. The clergy, too, displayed so much activity, and were so devoted to the work of their ministry, that Mr. *Steele*, though an Anglican, stated publicly (August 25, 1841) that since the world began there had never been so admirable a moral union among men as that which existed among the Catholic priesthood of Ireland. The selection of bishops in the Church in Ireland is altogether elective. Formerly the parish-priests chose from among those of their own rank, either within or without the diocese where the see was vacant, the person whom they wished to have as bishop, and forwarded his name to the Pope. The bishops of the province also forwarded two or three names, any of which might be selected.[1] At the present time the priests themselves forward the three names from which a choice is to be made, though the Pope is not limited to these. As has been already stated, the government offered a modified relief bill in 1813, on condition that the crown should enjoy the right of *veto* in the appointment of bishops, but the condition was indignantly rejected by the whole hierarchy of the United Kingdom, notwithstanding the urgent representations in its favor by some Catholic laymen and the efforts made by the Protestant advocates of Emancipation to have it accepted. In like manner the Irish bishops *unanimously* declined the endowment offered by the government in 1837, preferring to remain poor but *free*. The Irish people have always contributed generously to the support of their priests. Under the energetic management of the clergy, new churches sprung up everywhere. A handsome one was built at *Little Bray* in 1838, and placed under the patronage of *St. Peter*. The weekly contributions of the poorer classes were so munificent that from these alone nearly the whole cost of repairing old churches and building new ones has been defrayed. Among these the church at *Ballina*, the residence of the Bishop of

[1] See *Plowden*, iii., Appendix, pp. 1–18. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Killala, and the old St. Patrick's Cathedral at *Armagh*, may be instanced. The *Dublin Review*, started in 1836 by *O'Connell*, *Dr. Wiseman*, and *Mr. Quin*, was the ablest Catholic periodical published in Ireland. The noticeable improvement in the moral and material condition of the Irish people since 1840 is largely due to the indefatigable labors of the Capuchin, *Father Matthew*, the great apostle of temperance.[1]

§ 404. *The Catholic Church in Belgium and Holland.* (Cf. § 333.)

De Ram (Synodicum Belgicum), Nova et absoluta collectio Synodorum tam provincialium quam dioecesanar. Archiepiscopatus Mechlin., etc., T. I., Mechl., 1828; T. II., 1833; T. III. and T. IV., Gandav. "*Letters from Belgium*" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 627 sq.; Vol. VIII., p. 45 sq., 210 sq., 411 sq., 501 sq., 731 sq.; Vol. IX., p. 783 sq.)

The attempts made in Belgium to introduce the principles of Josephism, with a view to destroy the organization of the Catholic Church in that country, were heroically resisted by *Frankenberg* († 1804), the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines. His doctrinal declaration, dated June 26, 1789, concerning the General Seminary of Louvain, protesting against the erection of all seminaries of this character by Joseph II., is ample evidence that the clergy of Belgium were determined to withstand the hostile aggressions of the Illuminati and the Josephists. His zeal and activity exercised an influence which lasted until the close of the French domination, which affected only slightly the religious spirit of the country. While Belgium was under the dominion of *Holland* she made a long and determined struggle for the preservation of her faith and the *independence of the Church*. When *William*, Stadtholder of Holland, who professed Calvinistic doctrines, assumed the title of King of the Netherlands (March 16, 1815), and published a new constitution (July 15, 1815), he promised in general terms that the Catholic Church should enjoy complete freedom. But, as numerous paragraphs of the charter were

[1] *Lps.* Univ. Gazette, nro. 134 (1842). *Cf. the interesting details in the *Augsb. Gazette*, nros. 144 and 145, of 1843, and the *Bonn Review*, new series, year IV., nro. 4, pp. 208–210.

Hosted by Google

directly contradictory to the promise made, the Bishops of Ghent, Tournay, and Namur, and the Vicars Capitular of Malines and Liége drew up and published, July 28, 1815, an expostulation. No attention was paid to their remonstrances, and the new charter, though it failed to obtain a majority of the votes of the Committee of Examiners, was imposed upon the country, August 24, 1815, and from that time forth acts of violence and oppression against Catholics became more frequent and flagrant. Catholic Colleges and Universities were closed, and Catholic students of divinity were required to attend the lectures at the *Philosophical College*, established by a Protestant government at Louvain in 1825. So threatening was the discontent which these measures excited that King William was forced to conclude a *Concordat* with the Holy See in 1827.[1] Its execution, however, was delayed under various pretexts, and although the government released candidates for the priesthood from the obligation of attending the College of Louvain, it imposed other annoying restrictions upon bishops and students of divinity,[2] and made the Dutch language obligatory. National manners and customs were daily and studiously disregarded and outraged, and the forcible separation of *Belgium* from *Holland* was in consequence finally determined upon in 1830, though, in the revolution by which this was effected, the Belgian clergy, who, as a body, were peaceable and law-biding, took no active part. Since then Catholicity has been steadily on the increase in Belgium. Through the influence of such men as Cardinal *Sterckx*, Archbishop of Malines, and *van Bommel*, Bishop of Liége, it has been made to give tone to public opinion and character to education. Religious life revived, and convents sprang up over the country.

[1] See *The Catholic*, 1827, November nro., p. 203 sq.

[2] The conflicting views on this subject are given in *The Catholic*, 1825, Supplem. to December nro., p. XXXIII sq.; and 1826, January nro., p. 83–103, and Supplem., p. I. sq. *Tübing. Quart. Review*, 1826, p. 77 sq. *Smets*, Cath. Review of Cologne, Vols. I. and II. In consequence of these diverse criticisms, the King of Holland issued, in 1829, two ordinances, which, in appearance only, repealed the measures of 1825. See *The Catholic*, August, 1829, Supplem., p. XXIV. sq., and October, p. 47 sq.

Hosted by Google

Thoroughly alive to the dangerous influence of the *Philosophical College* of Louvain, the Catholics, after numerous conferences, came voluntarily forward and generously subscribed a sum sufficient to found, in 1834, a free *Catholic University* at Malines,[1] which was subsequently transferred to *Louvain*, and solemnly inaugurated on the 1st of December, 1835. This University is one of the most important foundations of this century, for, besides counteracting the liberalistic tendencies of the University of Brussels, it is a representative school, not alone of Catholic theology, but of every branch of professional science, as taught in Catholic institutions; and is, moreover, the most frequented seat of learning in Belgium. Fully appreciating the position of the Church, the Belgian clergy kept well abreast of the spirit of the age, seizing, making their own, and ennobling such ideas as they might, and putting the others aside. Here was harmony amid the din of conflict, and music amid a clamor of sounds, for the spirit of true liberty is ever in accord with the spirit of true faith. *A society was started for the diffusion of wholesome literature*, which did an immensity of good among the people. Belgium comes next after France and Bavaria in zeal for *home and foreign missionary work*.[2] The Abbé *Helsen*,[3] who had been suspended from the exercise of his priestly functions, in consequence of the irregularity of his moral conduct, attempted to found what he called the *Catholic and Apostolical Church*, and having received episcopal consecration from Fabre Palaprat, rented a room in the Masonic Lodge at Brussels, and began to say Mass in French and Flemish. The public gradually wearied of his declamations against the supposed immorality of the clergy. The Chamber slighted and insulted him, comparing him to *Châtel* and other politico-religious mountebanks. Like those of his French

[1] The plan of founding a University by a joint-stock company, as set forth in the circular of the Archbishop of Malines, and of the Bishops of Tournay, Ghent, Liége, Namur, and Bruges, may be found by referring to the journals of those times. The *Bonn Review*, nro. 9, pp. 189 sq.; *The Catholic*, July nro. of 1834, pp. 80–89.

[2] Cf. *Eccl. Gazette*, by *Hoeninghaus*, year 1839, nro. 72.

[3] *Bonn Review*, nro. 9, pp. 187–189.

Hosted by Google

prototype, his followers rapidly fell from his side, only a few fanatical revolutionists and uncompromising republicans remaining loyal to his teachings. Touched by the light of grace, Helsen returned to the truth, November 14, 1842, and died some time after at peace with the Church. The progress made by the *Religious Orders* in Belgium was simply marvelous. In 1829 there were in the whole country 280 houses of male and female religious, and in 1846 the number had increased to 779. Here devoted souls gave themselves up to meditation, teaching, serving the sick, and to such other offices of piety as are required by the social conditions of a civilized community. It is a strange phenomenon, and one fruitful in reflections, that in no country of Europe have the Religious Orders been so bitterly and persistently opposed as in Belgium, and in no other country of Europe have they gone on increasing so rapidly.

The Catholic Church in *Holland* has continued to hold its own against the inveterate hatred of the Calvinists, the disintegrating agency of Jansenism, and the adverse policy of a hostile government. According to the official census, there were, in January, 1840, 1,100,616 *Catholics* out of a population of 2,860,450.[1] The *Jansenistic schism of Utrecht*, which, unfortunately, has not yet come to a close, had in 1821 an archbishop at Utrecht, in whose obedience there were twenty-four pastors and two thousand five hundred and twenty schismatics; a suffragan bishop at *Haarlem*, under whom were twenty pastors and two thousand four hundred and thirty-eight souls; and a bishop at *Deventer*, who possessed neither pastors nor flock. These bishops are all excommunicated by the Holy See, and were it not for the support which the Jansenistic seminary at Utrecht receives from France, the schism of which it is the nursery, would have long since disappeared. Until quite recently the Catholics of Holland were collectively included in what was known as the *Dutch Mission*, presided over by a *Vicar Apostolic*, and divided into the seven districts or archpresbyteries of Holland-Zealand, Utrecht, Gelderland, Friesland, Groningen, Overyssel, and Salland, which were sub-

[1] Cf. *The Catholic*, 1825, Supplem. to February nro., pp. XVII.–XXVII.

Hosted by Google

divided into deaneries, and these again into four hundred stations or parishes. When Cardinal *Brancadoro*, Archbishop of Nisibis, who resided at Liége, came to Holland in 1776 as superior of the Dutch Mission, to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, the tokens of respect and attachment to the Holy See which the Catholic people exhibited were universal and unmistakable. The Mission was, later on, under the direction of *Ciamberlani*, who resided at Münster, whence all necessary dispensations were forwarded. He also presided in an informal way over the affairs of the Mission during the reigns of *Louis Bonaparte* and his successor, the Duke of Piacenza, but, after the restoration of the Protestant government, he was arrested at Malines in 1815, and conducted across the frontier, despite the indignant protests of the Catholics. This hasty and violent measure was reconsidered in 1823, and Ciamberlani again authorized to take charge of the Mission. His first official act on his return was to consecrate the Chapel and bless the *Seminary of Warmond*, near Leyden,[1] which the clergy and laity had built in 1819 out of their scanty means. There is no name held in more grateful remembrance by the Church and the clergy of Holland than that of the Abbé *Raynal*, almoner to the Spanish embassy at the Hague († July 6, 1822), who, after his expulsion from the diocese of Cahors by the French revolutionists, took up his residence in the Netherlands, where, by his zeal, his salutary influence upon the clergy, and his edifying life, he rendered invaluable services during a season of trial and difficulty to the Catholic Church of that country.

According to the articles of the Concordat, concluded between King William and the Holy See, of which mention has already been made, two suffragan sees should have been erected in the *Netherlands*, the one at Amsterdam and the other at Herzogenbosch (Bois-le-Duc), but this provision was never carried out. Catholic principle and Catholic feeling were wholly disregarded, and sometimes violently outraged,

[1] In 1828 there were in the ancient States of Holland four larger and three smaller seminaries, which it had been found necessary to erect after the closing of the University of Louvain.

Hosted by Google

and a Protestant church, aided by a Protestant government, was everywhere dominant.

It would seem that the very significant warning given by the revolution in Belgium in 1830 was not sufficient to secure full freedom to the Church in that country. Still, after the accession of *William II.*, October 7, 1840, there was a hope that an accommodation might be effected through the negotiations opened by the Nuncio, *Cappaccini*. The Calvinists were again beginning to show symptoms of the most intolerant bigotry, which fortunately had not resulted in any serious consequences, when Pius IX., on the 7th of March, 1853, re-established the Catholic hierarchy in Holland. It consisted of an archbishopric at *Utrecht*, with four suffragan sees at *Haarlem*, *Herzogenbosch*, *Breda*, and *Roermond*. In spite of the hostility of the government to religious houses, their number was constantly increasing. When the Netherlands were incorporated with the French Empire, in 1810, there were altogether only fifteen convents in the whole country, and these were all in North Brabant, and suppressed by Imperial decree of January 3, 1812, though the decree was never carried into effect. Nothwithstanding this unpromising condition of affairs, and the additional fact that William I. did what he could to retard the growth of the Catholic Church, numerous religious houses were founded in North Brabant and Limburg between the years 1830 and 1840.

That isolated portion of *Luxemburg*, which, under the designation of the Grand Duchy, was declared a dependency of Holland in 1839, was under the spiritual direction of a very worthy man, Mgr. *Laurent*, who, having been driven from Hamburg, where he had taken up his residence as Vicar-Apostolic of North Germany, found himself face to face with similar difficulties in his new diocese, whence he was also expelled in 1847. By the revolution of 1848, freedom of conscience was inscribed in the Charter of Rights, and now even the Jesuits have firmly established themselves in Holland.

Hosted by Google

§ 405. *The Catholic Church in Switzerland.*

The documents are found chiefly in the *Tüb. Quart. Review* of 1819 and subsequent years. *Rheinwald*, Acta hist. ecclesiast., ann. 1835, p. 31 et sq.; ann. 1836, p. 58 sq.; ann. 1837, p. 82 sq. *L. Snell*, Authentic Narrative of the Late Changes in Catholic Switzerland, Sursee, 1831. For the most recent times, see "*The Swiss Eccl. Gaz.*," from 1832. **Fred. Hurter*, The Attacks made on the Catholic Church in Switzerland since 1831, 4 pts, Schaffh. 1842, 1843. *Sigwart Müller*, The Struggle between Right and Might in the Swiss Confederacy, and My Own Share in It, Altdorf, 1864. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. IX., p. 853 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, p. 484–505.

The Church in Switzerland was formerly dependent for its ecclesiastical government upon the metropolitans of *Besançon*, *Mentz*, and *Milan*. The fulsome promises of the French, who came to that country in 1797, proclaiming that they desired to restore *liberty* to the descendants of William Tell, to free them from the government of an oligarchy, and to place them in the enjoyment of the rights of man, were, as in France, far from being fulfilled, and resulted only in political anarchy and religious disorganization. The relations of the western portion of Switzerland with the Church of France were severed. When political order had been in some sort restored (1803), the Catholic Cantons, then under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Constance*, petitioned the Holy See to establish a bishopric within their own territory. The petition was again urged in 1814, and finally granted by *Pius VII.* on the 7th of October.

In delivering the papal brief to the Diet, the Nuncio announced that the Holy Father had appointed *Goeldlin of Tiefenau*, Prior of the ancient abbey of St. Michael's, at Beromünster, Vicar Apostolic over three Cantons.[1] But while the representatives of the Cantons unanimously agreed that it was necessary to establish a see, and that the appointment was a good one, there were other matters of detail which were not so easily adjusted. Each Canton had its own interests; each member of the Diet his own views.

Unfortunately, no satisfactory settlement had been arrived

[1] Cfr. *Hurter*, l. c., p. 45–49. *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1820, p. 734–741; 1821, p. 164–171.

Hosted by Google

at, when news was received of the death of Goeldlin, in the prime of his life (1819). His successor, *Charles Rudolph of Buol Schauenstein*, Prince Bishop of *Coire*, was by no means so acceptable a choice, and the Canton of *Aargau* demanded to be again placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constance. The intention was to include the Cantons formerly belonging to Constance within the jurisdiction of the newly-reorganized see of *Basle*, whose incumbent was then residing at Offenburg, in Baden, and Pius VII. cut matters short by appointing as his suffragan and coadjutor the Prior, *Glutz Ruchti*, of the collegiate church of Soleure. By subsequent negotiations, a union was formed among the Catholic inhabitants of the Cantons of Basle, Lucerne, Berne, Soleure, and Aargau. Pius VII. settled the difficulty relative to the Abbey of St. Gall by creating it an episcopal see (July 2, 1823), and bestowing upon Charles Rudolph the double title of Bishop of *Coire* and *St. Gall.* The two sees were separated in 1836.[1] The proposal to unite by Concordat the original Cantons of *Uri*, *Schwytz*, and *Unterwalden* with the bishopric of Coire was rejected by the Pope, January 7, 1823. Finally, in reply to a petition from the Catholics of Geneva, the hot-bed of Calvinism, requesting the establishment of a bishopric in that Canton, *Pius VII.*, by the bull *Inter multiplices*, placed them under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Lausanne*, residing at Fribourg.[2] The way was now clear for a definite settlement of the ecclesiastical affairs of Switzerland, and accordingly a *Concordat* was entered into with Pope *Leo XII.*, and promulgated in May, 1828, by the bull *Inter praecipua Nostri Apostolatus munia.* The Concordat provided that the Catholic inhabitants of the Cantons of Lucerne, Soleure, Berne, Aargau, Basle, Zug, and Thurgau should form the *diocese of Basle*, the bishop to reside at *Soleure;* that the bishop of the diocese should have a chapter consisting of twenty-one canons and two dignitaries, the one appointed by the government, the other by the Pope;[3] and that to the

[1] *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1824, pp. 317–333; 1826, pp. 728–731.

[2] *Tüb. Quart. Review*, year 1820, p. 346–355. Cfr. p. 726–734; p. 741–744; year 1821, p. 363–366.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1828, p. 556–568.

Hosted by Google

canons should belong the right of electing the new bishop, to whom the Pope should give canonical appointment, etc. These stipulations were rejected by many of the cantons in whose name they had been made, and in consequence a new arrangement was entered into between Lucerne, Berne, Soleure, and Zug, on the one hand, and the Internuncio *Gizzi*, acting for the Pope, on the other,[1] to which Aargau and Thurgau gave their assent in 1830, during the pontificate of Pius VIII.[2] Finally, after some further negotiations,[3] it was determined to distribute the 882,859 Catholics in Switzerland in 1841 (the Protestants of all denominations at the same date numbering 1,292,871 and the Jews 1,755) into *six dioceses*, as follows: 1. The diocese of *Basle*, including the Cantons of Lucerne, Zug, Soleure (the residence of the bishop), Aargau, Thurgau, Basle, Zürich, and Berne (Jura); 2. The diocese of *Lausanne* and *Geneva*, including the Cantons of Fribourg, Geneva, Vaud, Neufchâtel, and Berne (as far as the Aar); 3. The diocese of *Sion* (Sitten), including the Canton of Valais; 4. The diocese of *Coire* (Chur) and *St. Gall*, including the Cantons of Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Glarus, Grisons, Appenzell, Schaffhausen, and *St. Gall*, which, by the Concordat of 1845, was again made a distinct see, thus forming the fifth diocese; and 6. A diocese whose jurisdiction was determined by the character of the subjects rather than by territorial limits, for it comprised all Catholics speaking the Italian language within the Canton of *Ticino*, and was, until July 22, 1859, under the care of the Bishop of *Como* and the Archbishop of *Milan*.[4] There being no archiepiscopal see in Switzerland, the bishops of that country are immediately subject to the Holy See, and there is, in consequence, a *Nuncio Apostolic* resident at *Lucerne*, a cir-

[1] *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1829, pp. 154–183.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1830, pp. 603–610. For the reasons of their refusal, see *Hurter*, pp. 49–56.

[3] *Ibid.*, year 1830, pp. 603–610.

[4] A full statement of the condition of religion in certain dioceses may be found in *The Catholic* of 1834, Vol. LIII., pp. 306–332; Vol. LIV., pp. 8–44; 1836, Vol. LXI., pp. 21–46; Vol. LXII., pp. 36–57, and 156–173; also in *Hurter*, l. c., concerning *Zürich*, pp. 361–369 sq.; concerning *Lucerne*, p. 407; concerning *Glarus*, pp. 481 sq.

Hosted by Google

cumstance that greatly facilitates the management of ecclesiastical affairs.

While there is probably no other country in which the principles of Modern Liberalism have taken such deep root, and developed into forms so various and conflicting as in the Helvetian Confederacy, neither is there any other country in which Liberals, in spite of ther internal dissensions, so completely lose sight of party lines in their common hostility to the Church, or combine with more hearty unanimity against her. This spirit has grown still more intensely malignant since the occurrence of the events of 1830 and 1831. Switzerland is called the land of freedom, but it is in reality under the tyranny of radicalism. Day after day, with unremitting continuity, the press scatters over the country profane jests and foul calumnies against Catholic priests, convents, and Jesuits; against the Pope and his Nuncio, and the Church and her institutions. And so unblushing has been the dishonesty practiced and so desperate the methods employed by these Liberals that they have even gone the length of forging papal bulls. To defend themselves against the attacks of this perfidious warfare, the Catholics in 1832 established the *Ecclesiastical Journal of Switzerland*, which, it was hoped, would revive and quicken religious sentiment among the people, maintain the rights of the Church and of religion, correct false assertions, and repel slanders. It was soon discovered that there were traitors among those professing to be defenders of the Church. Some Catholic theologians of the school of *Paolo Sarpi*, and infected with the poison of modern indifferentism, started in opposition to the *Ecclesiastical Journal of Switzerland* a paper called the *Religious Gazette for Germany and Switzerland*. Its editor, a certain *Fischer*, of indifferent reputation, drifting with the current of radical opinion, proclaimed that separation from the Holy See would be a supreme blessing to the Catholic Church in Switzerland. Encouraged by such disloyalty and treachery, the radical press grew more audacious and energetic, and poured forth an incessant stream of *irreligious calendars, blasphemous almanacs, atheistical pamphlets, historical and sacrilegious essays*, and *im-*

Hosted by Google

moral novels.[1] Animated by such feelings of hostility to the Catholic Church, representatives of the progressive party from the various Cantons assembled at *Baden* in 1834, and, ignoring all established relations and existing legal guarantees, drew up the instrument known as the *Articles of Conference*, by which the Church was reduced to a condition of civil servitude.

Gregory XVI., feeling that there was now a call upon him to act, issued, May 17, 1835, an encyclical letter[2] to all the Swiss bishops, condemning the Articles, which, however, were enforced, regardless of all protests, in many of the Cantons. Catholic families loving their faith and loyal to its teachings, took alarm, and wishing to provide a school where their children might receive proper training, they established a *college* at *Schwytz*,[3] which was placed under the direction of the Jesuits, whose pedagogical labors had been so successful at *Fribourg*, where a similar seat of learning had been founded three hundred years ago by the illustrious *Canisius*, and restored in 1818.[4] The Jesuits' college at Fribourg was frequented, not alone by the Catholic youth who had been withdrawn from the schools of Lucerne and Soleure, on account of the Liberalism prevalent there, but also by young men from every religious denomination and political party in Switzerland, and by others coming from foreign lands. There was also an *educational establishment* founded at *Montet*, in the same Canton, under the direction of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, in which a number of young ladies received instruction. The government of the Canton Aargau, among all the

[1] *Hurter*, in his comprehensive *Chronique Scandaleuse* of Modern Switzerland, has drawn a frightful picture of these excesses of the press.

[2] The articles of the conference, in fourteen paragraphs, or a new kind of church polity, in *The Catholic*, Supplement to the May number of 1834; *Hurter*, l. c., pp. 274 sq.; the Pope's Encyclica, in *The Catholic*, Supplement to the January number of 1836; and the *Tüb. Quart. Review* of 1835, p. 773–758.

[3] *The Catholic*, year 1836, Vol. LXII., p. 58 sq.

[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. LXII., p. 58 sq., 1836, concerning the College of Schwytz; concerning that of Fribourg, *ibid.*, 1834, Vol. LIV., p. 33–44; *Hurter*, l. c., p. 507 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 38 sq., 210 sq. *Piccolomini*, A few words on the Boarding Schools and the Colleges of the Jesuits in Switzerland, Ratisbon, 1843.

Hosted by Google

Swiss Cantons, has the distinction of having enacted the most severe law against the Church. In direct violation of the Federal Compact[1] of August 7, 1815, this Canton passed a law January 20, 1841, suppressing all convents within its confines, notwithstanding that some of them were coeval in origin with the very dawn of Swiss history.

Gizzi, the Apostolic Nuncio, and the Austrian embassador, *de Bombelles*, at once protested against the measure,[2] stating that it was not a question as to whether a few convents should cease to exist or not, but as to whether the principles of liberty should be maintained and the Federal Compact preserved or the contrary. The Great Council, they said, by suppressing Catholic convents, had at once violated the Twelfth Article of the Federal Compact, and dealt a blow at religious freedom. The discontent excited by this measure was so widespread and threatening[3] that the *Directorial Canton*, by an enactment, passed in the month of February, 1843, declared all sales of monastic property made since the meeting of the Diet in 1841 of no effect, and summoned the Canton of Aargau to revoke them, and to repeal other measures antagonistic to the then existing state of affairs, declaring its intention, in case of refusal, to proceed according to the principles upon which the Confederacy was based. It was a great comfort and consolation to the loyal children of the Church, amid these scenes of radical violence, to learn that a new constitution of a decidedly Catholic character had been adopted in *Lucerne* by a surprisingly large majority of the popular

[1] Paragraph Twelfth reads: "The cantonal governments will see to it that the monasteries and chapters are maintained, and that their prosperity is secure. Their possessions, like all other private property, shall be subject to tax and other imposts." Cf. *The Catholics of Aargau and Radicalism* (Memorial), 1843; also *Augsb. Univ. Gazette*, nro. 173, of 1843.

[2] *Le Journal des Débats*, August 9.

[3] Cfr. "Encroachments of the Government of Aargau upon the Catholics" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. II., p. 179 sq., 214 sq., 295 sq.) The Last Attempts against the Monasteries in Switzerland (*Ibid.*, Vol. IV., p. 204 sq., 281 sq.; Vol. VII., p. 422 sq.) "The Aargau State-paper" (*Ibid.*, Vol. VII., p. 532 sq.; Vol. VIII., p. 224 sq., 337 sq., 440 sq.) See also "*The Eccl. Journal of South Germany*," 1839, nros. 2, 4, and 6.

Hosted by Google

votes (March, 1842).[1] After numerous writings and prolonged discussion, it was resolved, in January, 1844, that the *nuns* of the convents of Fahr, Hermetschwil, Gnadenthal, and Baden, suppressed in 1841, should be permitted to again take possession of their houses. The *mitred Abbot* of the Benedictine monastery of *Muri*, who had been on trial for certain political offenses, was acquitted, declared exempt from all penalty, and the State adjudged to pay the costs.[2] The Radicals, however, had no intention of giving up the contest. In the Diet of 1844 the representatives from the Canton of Aargau made an unsuccessful attempt to have the Jesuits banished from the whole of Switzerland; and when, on the 24th of October of the same year, the inhabitants of Lucerne voted to recall the members of the Society, and place the theological schools of the Canton under their direction, the Radicals of the whole country rose in indignation.

In December, 1844, and again in March, 1845, two armies of volunteers, led against the Catholics of Lucerne, under pretext of overthrowing the *domination of the Jesuits*, were successively repulsed. Lucerne, now fully alive to the dangers that threatened her, entered into an alliance with the neighboring Catholic Cantons for their mutual protection. The Radicals now determined to avenge their defeat. As a preliminary step, they hired a vile wretch by the name of *Jacob Müller* to assassinate *Joseph Leu*,[3] a prosperous and honorable merchant, gifted with splendid oratorical powers, who had excited the hostility of his enemies because he was the leader in his day of every Catholic movement in Switzerland.

[1] The Third Article reads as follows: "The Apostolic and Roman Catholic religion is the religion of the whole population of Lucerne, and as such is the religion of the State. The government, therefore, shall in no way, either directly or indirectly, restrain, limit, or hinder the intercourse of priests, citizens, and communities with the authorities and functionaries of the Roman Catholic Church in whatever relates to religious ecclesiastical affairs. However, all ecclesiastical ordinances and regulations must be submitted to the government before publication. The relations of Church and State should be adjusted by an amicable understanding between the two powers. The State guarantees the inviolability of foundations and other ecclesiastical property."

[2] *The Catholic*, 1844, nro. 2; *South Germ. Eccl. Journal*, 1843, nros. 48 and 52.

[3] *Sigwart Müller*, Councilman Joseph Leu, of Ebersoll, Altdorf, 1863.

Hosted by Google

The assassin afterward confessed his crime, and was beheaded January 31, 1846. In the Cantons of Vaud, Berne, and Zürich the governments had voted against the expulsion of the Jesuits, but they were forced to yield to the dominant influence of the other Cantons which favored the measure. The opponents of the Jesuits and those desiring their expulsion and the suppression of their schools were daily gaining strength, and for this reason those Cantons which had either protected the Society or placed their schools under its direction, viz., Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Fribourg, and Valais, gave their support to the separate alliance (*Sonderbund*) formed in 1843, and appointed a council of war to act in the emergency of a conflict. On the 20th of July, 1846, the Diet, by a small majority, declared the Sonderbund inconsistent with the well-being of the Confederation, and therefore dissolved. To enforce this decree, the Diet brought a numerous army into the field, and a fratricidal and unholy war was commenced against the Catholics of the Sonderbund,[1] who were completely vanquished, but whether their defeat is to be attributed to too much confidence in the justness of their cause, or to the mistakes of their leaders, or to treachery, it is difficult to say. Fribourg was taken, after a short and ineffectual resistance, on the 9th of November, and the 23d of the same month the army of the Sonderbund was routed at Gislikon, near the frontier of Lucerne, and the seven Catholic Cantons passed under the despotic and intolerant government of the dominant party. Heavy war contributions were levied, forty convents were suppressed, religious freedom vanished, and the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva was sent into exile. Such were some of the results of this war, in every way so disastrous to Catholic Switzerland.[2] As we shall see further on, these deeds of violence called forth a reaction, which infused new life and fresh energy into the Catholics of that country.

[1] *Crétineau-Joly*, Histoire du Sonderbund, Paris, 1850, 2 vols.

[2] *The Catholic* of 1847 and 1848; also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. XX. and XXI.

Hosted by Google

§ 406. *The Catholic Church in Austria.*

Boost, Modern Hist. of Austria (1789–1839), Augsburg, 1839, p. 101 sq. *Beidtel*, Researches on the Situation of the Church in the Austrian States, Vienna, 1849. *Scharpff*, Pt. II., p. 74–93. *Gams*, Hist. of the Christian Church in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 509–561. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., p. 1060 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 2, p. 147 sq.

Alarmed at the symptoms of revolution which now began to show themselves, and which were the legitimate outcome of the fatal policy of his brother, Joseph II., *Leopold II.*, who became Emperor March 12, 1790, set his face against the liberalistic and philosophical tendencies which were being forced upon Austria in spite of herself, and, by the repeal of certain unpopular laws of his predecessor's, succeeded in allaying the secret agitation, which kept the Emperor in a state of uncertainty and excitement. Such of the laws of Joseph II. as interfered with the free administration of ecclesiastical affairs he either abrogated altogether or practically set aside. He closed the General Seminaries, permitted bishops to educate their clergy in their own schools, authorized the use of the Latin language in the administration of the Sacraments and other liturgical offices, and recognized the rights of the Roman Pontiff in whatever relates to the Sacrament of marriage. He also satisfied the claims of the Protestants by incorporating in the twenty-six articles of the laws of 1791 the edicts of 1608, 1647, and 1648, granting to the Lutherans and Calvinists of Hungary freedom of worship. Finally, he forced the Turks to conclude a treaty of peace, re-establishing the *statu quo* as it existed on the 9th of February, 1788, previously to the breaking out of the war. Though Leopold did much to ameliorate the condition of the Church by practically disregarding existing laws, he did not fully emancipate her from the *tyranny of a civil bureaucracy*. The system of Joseph II. was indeed ignored, but it had, nevertheless, as a whole, a legal sanction and a recognized existence.[1] Such was the state of affairs when *Francis II.* (March, 1792–1835) ascended

[1] *Baron von Eckstein*, The (Austrian) Clergy in their Relation to Public Instruction (*The Catholic* of 1828, Vol. XXVII., p. 11–21, 268–293).

Hosted by Google

the throne. This prince deeply sympathized with the Head of the Church in his misfortunes, and, taking as his patterns, not his immediate predecessors, but those more illustrious men of whom his ancestral house furnished so many, he became at once the patron of the Church and the *protector* of the Holy See. The Emperor was in Rome in 1819, and *Pius VII.*, happy to have an opportunity to give some token of his esteem for the royal House of the Hapsburgs, raised the Archduke *Rudolph* to the archiepiscopal see of Olmütz, and created him a cardinal. In 1842 *Gregory XVI.* conferred similar dignities, for a like reason, upon the Prince *Schwarzenberg*, Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg.

If the Church in Austria, nevertheless, continued for the half-a-century during which *Prince Metternich* was First Minister, subject to the Josephist system, and under the control of the civil authority, the fault is to be ascribed to the indifference of the bishops, rather than to the will of the government. Many of these bishops, men, too, of learning and irreproachable lives, had, by appointment of government, taken an active part in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs while the Church was still under the control of the State, and now, from force of habit, showed a certain tenderness and attachment to a system they themselves had helped to perpetuate, sincerely believing that the Church could not be equally well governed in any other way. But bitter experience soon showed that, no matter how beneficial such methods might seem in themselves, they were, in reality, whether intended to be so or not, encroachments of the civil authority upon the rights of the Church. For example, in 1802, "*the Court of Chancery*," acting upon representations made to it, and without consulting the bishops, passed two decrees, providing for the increase of the number of the secular clergy and the restoration of discipline in the convents.[2] Again, in 1804, new

[1] See § 390, at the beginning.

[2] In attempting to correct the existing evils by the very means by which they had been produced, the Aulic Chancery showed that it did not understand their real character. By the first autograph of April 2, 1802, it was prescribed that gymnasia, schools of philosophy, and diocesan seminaries should be established,

Hosted by Google

ordinances were published relative to public schools, removing them from the control of the bishops, and placing them under that of *consistories*, because these, being the creations of the State, would pursue its policy as regards methods of teaching, the selection of text-books, the conducting of examinations, and the mode of inspection. Again, in 1810, *Pehem's* work on canon law was thrown out of the schools, and that of *Rechberger* introduced, because the latter upheld a system of ecclesiastical polity in favor with government, and on the whole treated the Church as little better than a civil institution, and therefore dependent upon the State. But, since 1808, the bishops have enjoyed a larger measure of influence in whatever relates to primary schools and theological establishments, and in judging of the orthodoxy and moral fitness of aspirants to the priesthood. These measures, together with the restoration of seminaries and faculties of Catholic theology, led the way to the publication of many works of merit, which exercised a wide and beneficent influence. Such were the writings of Powondra, Reichenberger, Zenner, and others on pastoral theology, and of Klein, von Rauscher, and Ruttenstock on Church history. In appointing to bishoprics, the Emperor Francis was careful to select only men of distinction and ability, whose lives were an example to their flocks,[1] and who devoted themselves zealously and energetically to the primary schools, to public instruction of every grade, and especially to the training of young men for the priesthood. Of these it will be sufficient to enumerate *Sigismund, Count of Hohenwarth*, Archbishop of Vienna from 1803; *Wenceslaus Leopold Chlumczansky*, Bishop of Leitme-

and, if required, that a course of theology be added. Now, putting aside the circumstance that these measures were prescribed by a body incompetent to deal with such affairs, they could not possibly have served any useful purpose, because the Josephist programme and the uncatholic text-books were still retained, and the schools continued to be under the control of the State. The second rescript, of the same date, requiring religious to wear their habits and observe their rules, "except in the instances in which these had been modified by imperial decrees," and forbidding all intercourse with foreign superiors," was not, it would seem, of a character to restore discipline in the monasteries. *Brück*, Church Hist., pp. 758 sq. (Tr.)

[1] See list of Austrian bishops, apud *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 509–533.

Hosted by Google

ritz from 1802, and Prince-Archbishop of Prague from 1814; *Leopold Maximilian, Count de Firmian*, Archbishop of Salzburg, and from 1822 to 1832 Archbishop of Vienna; *James Frint*, Bishop of St. Pölten from 1827 to 1835; and *Francis Salm*, Bishop of Gurk and Klagenfurt († 1822), who, with generous hospitality, received the pious and learned *Benedictines*, among whom were such men as *Neugart* and *Boppert*, when they had been expelled from their monastery of *Saint-Blaise*, in the Black Forest.[1] In order to check the disintegrating spirit of the age, and to provide a system of education for youth, which should be at once serious and solid, and having as little in common with the sonorous and senseless phraseology of false philosophers as with the torpid lethargy of the enemies of true progress, the *Jesuits*, who had been so long misunderstood and misrepresented, were again invited to return to the Empire in 1820. The members of the Society at once opened their houses at Verona, Innspruck, Linz, Lemberg, and Tarnopol.

The *Redemptorists*, under that excellent man, *Clement M. Hofbauer*,[2] had already established themselves, in 1816, at Vienna. The Religious Orders soon received fresh and able allies in their struggle for the Gospel and the Church. Associating with himself *Zachary Werner* and other writers who shared his convictions, *Frederic Schlegel* began in the *Germanic Museum* and the *Austrian Observer* a vigorous assault upon Protestantism, which he continued with marked ability in his *lectures*. His writings revived the spirit of Catholicity in Germany, and exerted a powerful influence, particularly among the upper classes. In *Hungary*, where Protestantism had taken a faster hold on the people than in any other province of the Austrian Empire, a *national council* was convoked, with the consent of the Emperor, by *Alexander Rudnay*, Archbishop of Gran and Primate of Hungary, to meet on the 8th

[1] Cfr. *Gams*, Hist. of the Church in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I., p. 527–531, and the Würzburg *Chilianeum*, Vol. I., of 1862, p. 197–200.

[2] *Poesl*, Clement Maria Hofbauer, the first German Redemptorist, Ratisbon, 1844. *Sebast. Brunner*, C. M. Hofbauer and His Age, Vienna, 1858. *Hartinger*, The Life of the Servant of God, Cl. M. Hofbauer, Vienna, 1864. Life of the Venerable C. M. Hofbauer, Priest of the Congr. of Most Holy Redeemer. By a member of the Order of Mercy, New York, 1877. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

of September, 1822, the object of which was stated to be "to check the decay of morality; to ward off the evils with which the scourge of impiety was menacing both Church and State; and to re-establish ancient ecclesiastical discipline among the clergy and the people and in the schools."[1]

In other parts of the Austrian Empire, where the German language was spoken, the discussion of ecclesiastical and theological questions was carried on through the pages of the *Theological Journal of Frint* from the year 1808. It was discontinued for a while, but again revived in 1828 by *Pletz*, who conducted it until his death in 1840.[2] The *Linz Theological Monthly*, and still later the *Linz and Salzburg Quarterly* were each very valuable as able and reliable exponents of the principles of pastoral theology. The *Society of Mechitarists for the diffusion of Catholic literature* and the *Leopoldine Association* for the propagation of Christianity, particularly in America, rendered important services to religion. An unusual activity in the domain of speculative theology has quite recently begun to manifest itself, notably among the clergy of the school of *Günther*, whose ablest organ is the *Gazette of Catholic Theology of Vienna*, edited in 1850, and for years after by *Scheiner* and *Häusle*, and more recently by *Wiedemann*. Journals in the vernacular, among others the *Journal of Sion*, were also started in Bohemia and Hungary. Wholly regardless either of the laws of Joseph II. or of the clamor of the Liberals, the Hungarian bishops, when the *question of mixed marriages*[3] came up, exerted themselves with an energy only equaled by their prudence to have the teaching of the Church carried out, following in this the example set them by *Ziegler*, Bishop of Linz in 1838. After publishing a pastoral letter to their clergy, to which they added a general instruction on the

[1] A succinct historical notice, together with the documents, may be found in *The Catholic* of 1822, Vol. VI., p. 324–346. *Gams*, Vol. I., p. 535–540.

[2] *Vincent Seback*, Dr. Jos. Pletz, being a Biographical Sketch, Vienna, 1841.

[3] Cf. *Sion*, 1841, nros. 127–130; the circular of the bishops in *The Catholic*, February, 1841, Supplem., p. LIX. sq.; the letter of the Primate *Joseph Kopacsy* to the Estates of the County of Pesth, which had declared any priest refusing to give the nuptial benediction in mixed marriages liable to a fine of 600 florins (*Sion*, 1841, nro. 7, Supplem.) Cf., also, *The Catholic*, 1842, January number, Supplem., p. IV; March number, Supplem., pp. CXIX. sq.

Hosted by Google

subject of mixed marriages, they sent Bishop *Lonovics* to Rome to obtain specific instructions from the Holy See for Hungary, as those already given for the States of Austria did not seem applicable to that country.[1] Hoping to adjust the conflicting claims of both parties, the Emperor, by a rescript of July 5, 1843, and by a second of March 25, 1844, decided that in mixed marriages the parents should determine the kind of religious education to be given to their children, but that Catholic priests were under no obligation to perform any sort of religious act in celebrating such marriages.[2]

There can be no question but that the Church in Austria would have reached a much higher degree of prosperity if the governments of the Emperor Francis and his successor, *Ferdinand I.* (March 1, 1835; December 2, 1848), under the ministry of the all-powerful *Metternich*, had not impeded her free development by continual acts indicating a spirit of distrust, and by subjecting her to the restraints of the bureau of worship.[3]

Notwithstanding that the Catholic is the established religion of Austria, the government, in 1821, gave ample evidence of its tolerant spirit by permitting Protestants to open a theological school, in which the principles of the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions[4] are taught. This school obtained the title and privileges of a faculty in 1850, and the right to confer the degree of doctorate in Protestant divinity.

§ 407. *The Catholic Church in Bavaria.*

Concordat and Constitutional Oath of the Catholics in Bavaria, Augsburg, 1847. Remarks on the New Concordat of Bavaria, compared to the Recent French and Former Bavarian Concordat of 1807, published in January, 1818. *Gams*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 472–509. *Sepp*, Louis Augustus, King of Bavaria, Schaffhausen, 1869.

Few countries have been so deeply infected with the poison

[1] *The Catholic*, 1841, December, Suppl., p. LXXXV. sq., with the archiepiscopal instruction, 1842, February, p. LXIV. sq. *Mailath*, The Religious Troubles in Hungary, Ratisbon, 1845, 2 vols.

[2] *Augsb. Univ. Gaz.*, 1844, nro. 139, Suppl.

[3] *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XXII.

[4] *Wenrich*, John Waechter as a Man, as a Servant of the State and the Church, Vienna, 1831, p. 113–154.

Hosted by Google

of a false philosophy, or have suffered so much from the folly of the *Illuminati*, as Bavaria toward the close of the last and the opening of the present century. Of this proofs have been already given.[1] Shortly after the opening of the reign of *Maximilian Joseph* (February 16, 1799), and chiefly through the influence of his First Minister, *Montgelas*, seventy religious foundations and abbeys were secularized; and, some time later, four hundred convents were closed and destroyed, churches were profaned and spoiled of their treasures, laws were enacted regulating worship, and sacrilegious hands were laid upon things the most holy. When, in 1807, after numerous delays and a deal of shifty conduct, Montgelas finally made up his mind to conclude a Concordat with the Holy See through the Nuncio, *Della Genga*, Napoleon, with a view of impressing upon the Pope the fact that the Church could not get on except by conciliating him, stepped in and prevented further negotiations. Here the affair rested until 1816, when the Church in Bavaria was in so deplorable a condition that Pius VII. burst into tears in speaking of it.[2] Negotiations were again opened through the Bishop of Chersonese, Baron Haefelin, and Cardinal Consalvi, on the part of the Holy See, and again obstructed by the action of Montgelas, who claimed for the government the right of appointing to *all* benefices, not even excepting parishes. The obnoxious minister was finally removed from office February 2, 1817, and on the 5th of June of the same year, after some further objections had been set aside, an arrangement was agreed upon and signed by the king on the 24th of October following. Notwithstanding that the Pope had made very ample concessions, the enemies of the Church were not satisfied, and, acting under the lead of *von Feuerbach*, Governor of Ansbach, opposed the publication of the *Concordat* until after the new *Constitution* should have been promulgated, because the latter not only contained paragraphs contradictory of the Concordat, but also embodied the Edict of 1804, which was in spirit and drift Protestant,

[1] See § 392.

[2] *Gams*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 498, according to a Roman note of April 15, 1807. *Glücksohn*, "Bavaria under the Ministry of Montgelas," being several articles in the *Augs. Univ. Gaz.* of the year 1875.

Hosted by Google

rather than Catholic. The bishops and the bulk of the priests now refused to take the oath to the Constitution until assured by the declaration of the king (September 15, 1821) that it did not bind them to any civil obligations, and implied nothing contrary to the laws of the Church. Still the government officials continued to carry themselves as arbitrarily as ever, and to do great harm to the Church by their constant and growing interference with her administration. These circumstances gave peculiar weight and significance to the solemn advice of *Maximilian* to King *Louis*, on the accession of the latter to the throne in 1825. "*Guard and protect the faith*," said he, "*that Bavaria may again become what she was before she was led to betray her trust—the shield of religion and the cornerstone of the Church in Germany. Lift the Church from the bondage in which she is still held by those who distrust her without reason. Honor the priesthood to the end that the people may listen to their instructions and profit by them. Let neither priests nor libertines govern, and see that your kingdom be not the theater either of empty pageants or the outbursts of democratic violence.*"[1] The lessons of heroism and devotion bequeathed to him by his ancestors of the Thirty Years' War were not lost upon Louis, who, as an evidence of his loyalty to his royal mission, had an equestrian statue erected to Maximilian in one of the public squares of Munich;[2] pleaded in favor of the Archbishop of Cologne, when that prelate was in difficulties, with the filial love of a child and the power of a king (after 1837); and promoted Catholic science by becoming the sympathetic and generous patron of *Goerres* († January 29, 1848), *Phillips*, *Moy*, *Moehler*, *Klee*, *Doellinger*, *Haneberg*, *Reithmayr*, and many other able and brilliant writers. It was in this reign, also, whose auspicious opening gave promise of a more happy close than it had, that a *society* was formed *for the diffusion of wholesome Catholic books*, such as should counteract the influence of

[1] See *Görres'* remarkable memoir, entitled "*Prince Elector Maximilian to King Louis of Bavaria on the occasion of his accession to the Throne*" (*The Catholic*, 1825, Vol. XVIII., p. 219–249.

[2] Cfr. "The Equestrian Statue of Prince Elector Maximilian," in the *Hist. and Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., p. 449–454; and "Prince Elector Maximilian and Father *Dominic*, in the *Sion*, 1830, nro. 133, or op. Nov. 6.

Hosted by Google

the worthless and pernicious works of modern literature, and afford reading which, while recreating, would not poison the mind, and, while warming the heart, would not corrupt it; that Catholic *art*, inheriting the traditions of past ages, their majesty, sobriety, dignity, again revived; that ancient and decayed cathedrals were restored, the unfinished ones of Ratisbon, Bamberg, and Spire completed, and new churches built, which rival in architectural beauty and artistic decoration those of any other period. Among these may be mentioned the Basilica of St. Boniface, which is circular in form, and whose dome rests upon sixty-four monoliths of gray marble, and is resplendent with gold and frescoes; the cruciform church of St. Ludwig, embellished with Cornelius' fresco of the Last Judgment; the handsome Gothic church of Mariahilf, in the neighboring district of Au, whose gorgeous windows of stained glass and exquisite specimens of wood-carving excite the admiration of every lover of the beautiful; and, finally, the Court Chapel of All Saints, which, apart from its architectural merits, contains a wealth of art-treasures. It was in this reign that painting renewed her ancient triumphs, and produced works which, under forms of fascinating beauty and surpassing loveliness, breathe a spirit of divine inspiration, and give fitting expression to those grand conceptions that fill the Christian mind. Then, too, the *episcopacy* was adorned by bishops (Sailer, Wittmann, and Schwäbl) who, by their vigilance, energy, and self-sacrifice, perpetuated the traditions of the saintly men, who had filled the episcopal see of Ratisbon, and were now its enduring glory. *Bishops were again allowed the fullest freedom in their relations with the Holy See;*[1] the convents of the Carmelites, Capuchins, and Franciscans, conformably to the royal promises given in the Concordat (art. VII.), were restored to their owners; the Brothers of Mercy and the Augustinian Friars were permitted to return; the Redemptorist Fathers (from 1842) and the Sisters of Charity again opened their houses; the Servites and *Benedictines*[2] were reinstated; the Sisters of

[1] On the free intercourse of the Episcopacy of Bavaria with the Holy See, cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., pp. 593–627.

[2] The documents concerning the foundation of the Benedictine establishments

Hosted by Google

the Schools entered upon their work of teaching, and the *Sisters of the Good Shepherd* set about reclaiming the erring and shielding those in danger from the temptations to which they were exposed.[1] Seminaries for the education of candidates for the priesthood were established, munificently endowed, and placed under the direction of men eminent alike for theological learning and priestly virtues.[2] Finally, an association (*Ludwig's Verein*)[3] was founded, and received the royal approbation, for the conversion of unbelievers, both in *Asia* and *America* (from 1839).

Such was the consoling sight offered to the admiration of the faithful by a State as liberal to error as it was loyal to truth, and as sincerely tolerant as it was profoundly Catholic; which recognized and rewarded merit wherever found, whether among Catholics or Protestants,[4] and raised to positions of eminence all persons, regardless of religious profession, whom their contemporaries judged worthy of being so honored. It will be sufficient to instance *Puchta*, the great civilian; *Stahl*, the celebrated canonist; *Rückert*, the Orientalist and lyric poet; and *Schelling*, the philosopher of identity.

---

in the diocese of Augsburg are apud *Rheinwald*, Acta historico-ecclesiastica, anno 1835, p. 204 sq. See *The Bonn Review*, nro. 14, p. 238 sq.; nro. 18, p. 202 sq.

[1] On the establishment of this Order in the diocese of Munich, see *Sion*, 1839, nro. 64, Supplem., and the statutes of the Order in *Sion*, 1840, nro. 134, Supplem.

[2] Cfr. *Wolf*, The Life and Influence of Louis I., King of Bavaria from 1786 to 1841, Augsburg, 1841.

[3] The Statutes are in *Sion*, 1839, nro. 11; Circulars in behalf of the Association, *ibid.*, nro. 64; Proposals made to the Society, *ibid.*, 1841, nro. 29; Project for the foundation of Mission-houses in Germany (*Catholic Sunday Paper* of Mentz, 1843, nro. 6).

[4] Bishop Schwäbl's letter to Eberhard is in the Cath. and Eccl. Gaz. of *Hoenighaus*, 1841, nro. 47, June 10, and Eberhard's crafty answer in the 18th of July number. As to the new complaint of the Protestants against the *genuflexion* made by the *soldiery* before the Blessed Sacrament, see *Doellinger*, Letter to a Deputy, Munich, 1843. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XII., p. 744. *Ruland*, Series et vitae professorum ss. Theol. qui Wirceburgi afundata academia (anno 1582) usque ad annum 1834 docuerunt, etc.; accedunt analecta ad hist. ejud. SS. Facultatis in quibus statuta antiqua divi Juli nondum edita., Wirceb. 1835.

Hosted by Google

§ 408. *The Catholic Church in Prussia.*

Theiner, Situation of the Catholic Church in Silesia, Ratisbon, 1852, 2 vols. ***Gams***, l. c., Vol. I., p. 561. *A. Menzel*, Modern Hist. of Germany, Vol. XI.; 2d ed., Vol. VI.

The contrast between Catholic Bavaria and Protestant Prussia, as revealed by the light of modern history, is in many ways remarkable. In the former there was unity of science, unity of art, and unity of institutions; in the latter Catholics and Protestants were in unceasing conflict with each other. Inheriting the traditions of the House of Brandenburg, Prussia was the natural patron of Lutheranism; and though she ceased to be wholly Protestant after the accession of the Catholic provinces acquired by *Frederic II.*, she always continued the consistent foe of Catholicity, at one time attempting to merge it into Protestantism, at another to mold it after her own fashion; excluding Catholics from all offices of public trust, whether important or insignificant; preventing the free election of bishops and prelates and of abbots of chapters and convents; introducing the spirit of Protestantism into the schools by craft, where that was possible, by violence where it was not; requiring the children born of mixed marriages to be brought up in the Protestant religion; in fine, giving the most complete and varied proof that the famous saying of Frederic II., "In my States one may go to Heaven as he likes," was but a sonorous and meaningless phrase.[1]

Frederic William III. (1797–1840) pursued the same policy during his reign, and slightly improved upon it; for, the better to realize his plans and attain his end, which was to replace Catholic institutions wherever they existed by others Protestant in spirit and form, he adopted the theories of *Hegel*

[1] Cfr. The Relations of Frederic the Great to the Catholic Church (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. I., p. 321–338). Cfr., besides, Frederic William III.'s letter to his relative, the Duchess of Koethen, on the occasion of her own and her husband's return to the Catholic Church, and likewise several of his declarations hostile toward the Catholic Church. See *The Catholic*, 1826, Vol. XXI., p. 1–22; Vol. XXII., p. 206 sq., and 1826, Suppl. to January number, p. XIV.; Suppl. to April number, p. XI. sq.; Suppl. to July number, p. I.–V.

Hosted by Google

on State supremacy.[1] The result of this long, persistent, and perfidious policy of oppression was at first to deaden the energy of faith among true believers, but, as time went on, to call it again into life, and to rouse feelings of resistance.

In 1821 *Prince Hardenberg* hastily terminated the negotiations commenced at Rome by *Niebuhr* and *Consalvi*, and the bull *De Salute Animarum*, which was their outcome, marked the opening of a new era for Catholics. One of the immediate results of this important bull was the reorganization of the archbishopric of Cologne and of the bishoprics of Treves, Münster, and Paderborn, in the Rhenish provinces; of the archbishopric of Gnesen and Posen and the bishopric of Ermeland; and the endowment of the Prussian chapters. *Niebuhr*, though an enemy to the Court of Rome, and believing Catholicity to be essentially hostile to the country he represented, nevertheless put aside his prejudices for the time, and, during his residence as embassador at Rome, adjusted the existing differences in a way honorable to his character as a man and creditable to his reputation as a diplomatist. They were, however, again revived some time later by *Bunsen*, the Prussian Chargé d'Affairs at Rome,[2] and settled with the utmost difficulty. The religious controversies originating in Prussia, whence they spread through all Germany, and thence across the ocean to another continent, may be accounted for by the following reasons: 1. Catholicity and Protestantism are, from the nature of their respective claims, essentially opposed to each other; 2. The claims of the Church and the claims of the civil authority will necessarily conflict where kings are absolute, because she has ever resisted and must continue to resist any and all attempts to take away her independence

[1] The *Augsb. Univ. Gaz.*, August 7, 1841; "Hegelianism and Christianity in Prussia" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., p. 81–91), and "German Letters" (*Ibid.*, Vol. X., p. 1 sq., and especially nro. V.); "Prussia's Relations to the Church, Past and Present" (*Ibid.*, Vol. X., p. 665–681); *William von Schütz*, "Canon Law in the Rhenish Provinces," Würzburg, 1841. *Laspeyres*, History and Actual Organization of Catholicism in Prussia, Vol. I., Halle, 1839.

[2] Cfr. *Niebuhr's* Correspondence, Hamburg, 1839. See also Niebuhr and Bunsen as Diplomats at Rome (*Hist.* and *Poltt. Papers*, Vol. V., p. 270 sq., 397 sq., 531 sq.)

Hosted by Google

and to interfere in the government of her internal affairs;[1] 3. And this reason is more special, the essential negative character of which Protestantism can not divest itself.

Moreover, Protestant ideas generally acquired unusual preponderance and prestige after the celebration of the Reformation Jubilee in 1817, and in counteracting these *Moehler's Symbolism* largely contributed, and produced a powerful effect on the faith and conscience of Catholics.

Previously, however, to the reorganization of the ecclesiastical province of the Lower Rhine, other events had transpired of great utility to the Church in Prussia. Thus, for example, by the establishment of the new *University of Bonn*, a faculty of Catholic theology was given to the Rhenish provinces; in 1818 the *Lyceum Hosianum* was reopened in the diocese of Ermeland; and "grand seminaries" were founded in other dioceses. Again, in 1834, the *Academy of Münster* was permitted to exercise the privileges granted in former ages by Emperors and Popes, and was thus in a position to reward merit by conferring such titles and dignities as were in its power to give.

The Catholic population of the provinces recently annexed to Prussia, who were never quite reconciled to their new masters, frequently protested against the military regulations, by which the Catholic portion of the army were not only deprived of all spiritual ministrations by their own priests, but forced to attend Protestant service[2] once in the month, and against the unjust discrimination by government in making appointments to professorships in universities, to tutorships in schools, and to judgeships in the courts. The publicity given to these grievances through the press tended to make the Catholics look with suspicion upon the policy of the government. The individual instances were collected and published under the apparently inoffensive title of "*Documents to*

[1] Cfr. The Overweening Tendency of the Temporal Power to Encroach upon the Government of the Church, in the *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1831, p. 1–43; State of Catholicity in Prussia (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., p. 239 sq., 291 sq.)

[2] Order of the Cabinet, issued on the 2d of February, 1810, apud *Rintel*, Defense of Martin de Dunin, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, p. 120; Essay, etc., p. 80 sq.

Hosted by Google

Serve for a Church History of the Nineteenth Century,"[1] to which was added an opinion given by *Claussen*, Provost of the Collegiate Chapter of Aix-la-Chapelle, relative to the execution of the brief of Pius VIII., addressed to the Rhenish bishops, on *mixed marriages*. This memorial, which gave a catalogue of the grievances suffered by Catholics, and charged the Prussian government, among other things, with having influenced the *election of bishops*, was productive of very important results.

The elevation of *Clement Augustus de Droste* to the archbishopric of Cologne took place at the very time when other complicated events of unusual gravity were transpiring. While Vicar-General of the diocese of Münster, Droste had had a serious misunderstanding with the government on the subject of ecclesiastical studies;[2] and to render his position still more delicate, he was now placed over a see whose last incumbent, Count *Ferdinand Spiegel*, had favored the teaching of *Hermes*, which had been condemned by the Holy See, September 25, 1835, because of its rationalistic and Pelagian tendencies and of its erroneous treatment of Catholic dogmas. Archbishop Droste, being long known as an outspoken enemy of the system of Hermes, felt now that there was on many accounts a call upon him to prevent its spread among the younger clergy, and he therefore drew up eighteen propositions, chiefly directed against the Hermesian doctrines, which he required those preparing to take Orders, and some chaplains about to become pastors, to subscribe under oath before being advanced to their new honors. For a similar reason, the archbishop suspended some of the professors at the University of Bonn and the Seminary of Cologne and silenced others. The government now took umbrage at the archbishop's conduct, chiefly on two grounds: first, because he had acted without consulting it; and, second, because the propositions,

[1] Essays on the Ch. H. of the Nineteenth Century, Augsburg, 1835, usually styled the "*Red Book*." See the answer headed, The Catholic Church in the Rhenish Province of Prussia and Archbishop Clement Augustus of Cologne, Frankfort, 1838. (*Ellendorf*), The Cath. Church in Prussia, Rudolstadt, 1837.

[2] For documents, consult the *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1820, p. 511 sq.

Hosted by Google

but notably the *eighteenth*, infringed the rights of the State;[1] and, having consulted some ecclesiastics of the *school of Hermes*, who, being *interested* parties, gave a necessarily biased judgment on the character of the propositions,[2] ordered the archbishop to reconsider his action, threatening him with various penalties if he should refuse. On the Hermesian question the government showed a disposition to yield. It intimated to the archbishop that his wishes might be carried out if his forms and methods of procedure were somewhat modified, adding that such modifications would tend more certainly to secure his end. But on the question of *mixed marriages*, which it regarded as of vastly more importance, it demanded a corresponding concession on the part of the archbishop.

Count Ferdinand Spiegel, the predecessor of Clement Augustus, had seriously compromised the reputation acquired by his many services to the diocese of Cologne, by addressing to his Vicars-General a *Convention*, accompanied by an *instruction on mixed marriages* (1834), wholly inconsistent with the tenor of the brief of *Pius VIII.*, with which, however, it was represented to Clement Augustus *as being in complete harmony*.[3] In his brief *Venerabiles fratres*, Pius

[1] "I solemnly promise to obey my archbishop in whatever relates to doctrine and discipline; to respect and obey him, without any mental reservation; and I pledge myself, conformably to the spirit of the Hierarchy, not to appeal from the decision of my archbishop to any one other than the Pope, the Head of the Universal Church."

[2] Some of these opinions appeared in print, e. g., that which is headed Responsum sedecim prioribus earum thesium, quae sub titulo: "Theses neoapprobandis et aliis presbyteris Archidioeceseos Colon. ad subscribendum propositae" innotuerunt, in serm. latin. conversum edendum curavit P. Q., Darmstadt, 1837, which translation was made upon the publication of Göttingen, 1837.

[3] It should be borne in mind that even before the occupation of *Silesia* by Prussia the question of mixed marriages had there been raised. Cfr. the Essay entitled Conduct of the Prince Bishops and Vicars-General of Breslau with Respect to Mixed Marriages from 1709 to 1743 (*Sion*, 1841, nro. 114, Sept. 19, Supplement). This elaborate essay contains important documents. The Catholics (says the Protestant, *Chas. Hase*, in his Ch. H., p. 636) had been in the habit of applying to the case of Protestants the long established usage condemning all marriages with heretics. But, after the Thirty Years' War, the custom of mixed marriages had become established among the people. According to ordinary German usage, where no marriage compact determined the matter otherwise, the children were educated according to the faith of the parent with whom they corresponded in sex. A peculiar legislation, based on the principle of a certain legal equality, was gradually formed in the different States on this subject, with respect to which nothing was said by the Roman authorities. In

Hosted by Google

VIII. had lamented his inability to remove the difficulties surrounding the bishops of the Rhenish provinces, and to harmonize the laws of the Church on mixed marriages with the royal decree of 1825, relative to the education of children born of such unions; whereas the instruction of Spiegel represented that the ecclesiastical discipline on mixed marriages had been so modified that there was no longer any obstacle to prevent obedience to the Cabinet order of 1825.

While Archbishop *Spiegel signed the Convention unconditionally*, making no provision for papal approbation, Chevalier *Bunsen*, acting within his instructions from the Prussian government, *specially stipulated that it should not be valid unless it received the royal sanction.* After placing the Convention and the Instruction beside the brief of Pius VIII., and finding, *upon close examination*, that both of them were *in disaccord* with it, Clement Augustus expressed his determination of following the teachings of the Pope in all instances in which the Institution of his predecessor deviated from them, saying that he did not wish, like the late Bishop of Treves, to retract on his death-bed what he should never have done during his life. After so decided an expression by the archbishop of the line of conduct he meant to pursue, all thoughts of an accommodation vanished. The archbishop continued steadfast, the government obstinate, and, in consequence, affairs came to a crisis. The courageous pastor of Cologne was forcibly dragged from his archiepiscopal see and cast into prison, November 20, 1837, and finally shut up in the fortress of *Minden*, on the alleged charges, as stated in the ministerial decree, of having broken his word, undermined the laws, and, by rousing the passions of the people, divided them into two revolutionary parties. This act of violence created a profound impression among all Catholics, evoking feelings of indignant sorrow, which were intensified by the foul calumnies with which the unimpeachable character of the archbishop was aspersed. Contrary to what had been anticipated, the Pope was not the least frightened by this malignant persecution, and, while preserving his serene dignity, exhibited an unusual degree of firmness and courage. On the 10th of December, 1837, he published an *Allocution*, in which he protested before the whole civilized world against these outrages, perpetrated by the enemies of the Church, closing in the following words: "We declare to-day, solemnly and publicly, what we have always held privately, though we have never before expressed it openly, viz., that we disapprove and condemn all practices introduced into the Kingdom of Prussia, so far as these conflict with the true sense of our predecessor's instruction on the subject of mixed marriages." These words produced a deep impression on *Martin of*

Prussia the common law was so changed that, where the unanimous wish of the parents was not opposed to it, the children were required to be educated in the church of the father. By an order of the Cabinet, issued in 1825, this requisition was extended to the province of the Rhine, and to Westphalia, by declaring that any obligations of betrothed persons to the contrary were not binding, and any requirements made as conditions of the marriage rite by the Church were unlawful. But the ceremony of marriage, without a promise that the children should be educated in the Catholic faith, had previously been performed frequently in Eastern and rarely in Western Prussia. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Dunin,[1] Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, who, as early as January, 1837, and *without any knowledge of the events transpiring at Cologne*, had expressed his doubts to the government as to the legality of the practices followed in mixed marriages, which obtained to some extent in his diocese, requesting that, in order to their correction, he might be allowed either to publish the brief addressed by Pope Pius VIII. to the Rhenish bishops, to apply to the Holy See for a decision of the question, or, finally, to comply with the instructions of the bull *Magnae nobis admirationis*[2] of Benedict XIV., which was still in force. As none of these proposals was accepted, the archbishop, on the 21st of October, 1837, addressed his request directly to the king, who not only refused to grant it, but on the 30th of December following gave his approval to a ministerial measure, whose drift ran directly counter to the archbishop's proposition. The archbishop was further informed that, *notwithstanding the Papal Allocution of December 10th*, no change should be made in the existing practice. The archbishop had now to choose between the commands of the king and the instructions of the Pope, and convinced that in a matter of this kind he was in conscience bound to obey the *latter* rather than the former, contrary to the royal will, he published in February, 1838, a *stringent* Pastoral Letter, embodying the teaching of the bull of Benedict XIV., in which he pronounced sentence of suspension on any priest who from that time forth should solemnize a mixed marriage without having first obtained ample guarantees that the children born of it should be brought up in the Catholic religion. By the government, the Pastoral was declared null and void; protection was promised to all priests who would disobey its instructions; and the archbishop himself was arraigned before the Superior Court of Posen on the charges of disobedience and high treason. While *denying the competence* of the Court, the archbishop obeyed the summons to go *to Berlin*. Negotiations were again tried, but resulted in nothing, and in April, 1839, a judicial sentence was rendered, declaring the archbishop guilty of disobedience, deposing him from his office, and condemning him to imprisonment in a fortress for a term of six months. After his release, he again attempted to bring about an understanding, but in vain; and, having returned to his diocese without the king's leave, and against his will, was again arrested and confined in the fortress of Colberg.

The persecution suffered by these two venerable prelates excited the sympathies of the whole Catholic world, and in Germany *caused a reaction in favor of the Catholic Church* more loyal, outspoken, and enthusiastic than had been known for many years. The clergy of the diocese of Gnesen and Posen gave proof of their fidelity to the Church and their attachment to their archbishop by *unanimously protesting* against the interference of the civil authority in *spiritual* affairs, and

[1] †*Pohl*, Martin of Dunin, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, being a Biographical Sketch, Marienburg, 1843.

[2] See p. 621.

Hosted by Google

against the course pursued by the government toward the chief of their diocese. Thirteen American bishops, assembled in *Provincial Council at Baltimore*, sent a letter of condolence (dated May 20, 1840), expressing their deep veneration for these two noble confessors of the faith.[1] With the exception of *Sedlnitzky, Prince-Bishop of Breslau*, who, owing to the difficulties of his position, resigned his see in August, 1840,[2] and died an apostate at Berlin in 1871, all the bishops of Prussia pursued the same course as the two archbishops in regard to mixed marriages.

The accession of *Frederic William IV.* to the throne of Prussia, June 7, 1840, revived the drooping hopes of the Catholics, who seemed to feel confident that this prince would bring the disagreeable business to a speedy close. Viewing the question in its true light, and without allowing his judgment to be warped by the clamors and sophisms of the press,

[1] For the Latin original, see Concilia Provincialia Baltimore habita, ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849, pp. 180 sq. Cf. *Sion*, 1840, July number, p. 874.

[2] Statement of the Conduct of the Prussian Government in relation to the Archbishop of Cologne, by *Moy*, Berlin, 1838. This work considers the conduct of the government from a historical, legal, and political point of view. *Roman* Memorial of March 4, 1838, issued from the office of the Secretary of State (Germ., Augsburg, 1838). *Joseph von Görres*, Athanasius, Ratisbon, 1838, 4 editions. Shortly after there appeared: 'The Imprisonment of the Archbishop of Cologne, by a Jurisconsult (*Lieber*), Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1837, 1838, 3 pts. *J. J. Döllinger*, Mixed Marriages, Ratisbon, 1838, of which there are five editions. *Jos. von Görres*, The Triarians, H. Leo, Drs. Marheinecke and Bruno, Ratisbon, 1838. *J. J. Ritter*, Irenicon, Lipsiae, 1840. *Kuntsmann* and *Kutschker*, Mixed Marriages, see p. 621, note 2. *Second Allocution* of the Pope, of the 13th of September, 1838; the Answer, in the *State Gazette* of Prussia, December 31, 1838; the Rejoinder of the Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, dated January 5, 1839 (*Polit. Gaz. of Munich*, February 1, 1839, and *Sion*); State Paper, published at Rome, in answer to the *Prussian Gazette* of December 31, 1838. Cfr. the Legal Opinions and Pleadings in favor of the Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, by *William von Schütz* and *Rintel*, and several essays of *Guido Görres* and *Phillips*, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. I.–V. *Chas. Hase*, The Two Archbishoprics, being a Fragment of Contemporary History, Lps. 1839. *Bretschneider*, Baron of Sandau, or Mixed Marriages, 3d edit., Halle, 1839. *Goetz*, Baron of Wiesau, being an Offset to Baron of Sandau, Ratisbon, 1839. See also the bibliography given in *Rheinwald's* Repertory, years 1838 and 1839, and Autobiography of Count *Sedlnitzky*, Berlin, 1872, and *Brück*, Ch. H., p. 753.

Hosted by Google

Frederic William at once set about adjusting the relations between Church and State, and authorized *Mgr. Dunin* to return to the faithful of his diocese (June 29, 1840),[1] who had never ceased to deplore his absence and to pray that he might soon be back again. Immediately on his return, the archbishop issued a pastoral to his clergy (Aug. 27, 1840), advising them to cultivate peaceful relations with non-Catholics, adding that, since the civil law forbade them to exact guarantees requiring the children born of mixed marriages to be brought up in the Catholic faith, they should carefully abstain from doing aught that might give color of sanction to such unions. Nearly two years later (March, 1842) he reminded the clergy, inasmuch as they were the ministers of peace, whose office was not to ruin but to save souls, to avoid all public denunciation; to hear the confessions, when required, of those who had married outside the Church, and to administer the Sacraments to them when sick and desiring reconciliation; because, said he, the mercy of God surpasseth the perversity of man.[2] The archbishop (December 26, 1842) was the more ready to make these concessions, since the king daily gave fresh proofs of his good will toward the Church and of his desire to restore to her her freedom. That the archbishop's confidence was not a mistaken one was soon proved by a series of royal acts of unusual liberality. By a decree of January 1, 1841, the king surrendered his claim to the royal *placet* in spiritual affairs, and granted to bishops the *fullest freedom* in their *intercourse with the Holy See;* and, by a second, of February 12 of the same year, he *established a Catholic department* in the ministry of Public Worship. The satisfactory settlement of the affairs of Cologne is also to be ascribed to the conciliatory temper of the king.[3] Acting in accord with arrangements

[1] Return of the Archbishop to Gnesen and Posen (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VI., pp. 428–442). *Hase*, l. c., p. 253.

[2] The first Pastoral letter is in the *Sion*, 1840, nro. 111, in Latin and in German, p. 117. As to the second, see *The Catholic*, 1842, June number, Suppl., p. CIX. sq.

[3] *Jos. von Görres*, Church and State on the Termination of the Cologne Troubles, Weissenfels on the Saale, 1842. Shortly thereafter appeared "Peace between Church and State," a work written with reference to the well-known Berlin Exposition, by *Clement Augustus*, Münster, 1843.

Hosted by Google

made at Rome by Count Brühl, the King of Bavaria authorized Mgr. *de Geissel*, Bishop of Spire, a firm yet prudent man, to leave his kingdom and become coadjutor to Clement Augustus, in the diocese of Cologne, with the right of succession. The King of Prussia, on his part, publicly avowed that he had never believed the reports connecting the name of the occupant of the see of Cologne with political and revolutionary intrigues. When this prelate was dragged from his diocese and carried off to Minden, a proclamation severely reflecting upon his character was published, which was soon openly withdrawn by Bodelschwing, the First President.

Feeling that ample and honorable satisfaction had been done him, *Clement Augustus* now voluntarily resigned the administration of his diocese. "From now until the hour of my death," said he in a touching letter,[1] taking farewell of his flock, "I shall not cease to lift up my hands to Heaven, as Moses did of old, and by my fervent prayers draw down the blessings of the Almighty upon my people." He died October 19, 1845. The king continued to show tokens of his good will toward the diocese of Cologne, for, besides giving large sums himself to aid in completing the magnificent Cathedral of that city, he also made an appeal to the whole Christian world to send contributions for the same purpose.[2]

§ 409. *The Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine.* (Cf. § 396.)

Essays on the Contemporaneous History of Catholicity in Germany, by *J. M. L. R . . . s*, Strasburg, 1823. *Lang*, Collection of the Ordinances of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Tübingen, 1835. By the *same*, Collection of Catholic Church-laws in Würtemberg, Tübingen, 1836. **State of Catholicity* in Baden, Ratisbon, 1841-1843, 2 pts. Answer by *Mebenius*, under the same

[1] The letter of the Prussian king to Clement Augustus is found in *The Catholic*, 1842, February number, Suppl., p. LXX. sq. Clement Augustus' Valedictory in *The Catholic*, 1842, May number, Suppl., p. LXIII. sq. The *Coadjutor's* Pastoral Letter in the *Sion*, 1842, March number. *Stoeveken*, The Life, Works, and Death of Clement Augustus, described for the German People, Mentz, 1846.

[2] The *Catholic Journal* of Cologne gives an account of an association founded in Mexico, in answer to the appeal of the Prussian king, to aid in completing the cathedral.

Hosted by Google

title, Carlsruhe, 1842. *Friedberg*, The State and the Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Lps. 1871. †*Longner*, The Relations of the Bishops, from a Legal Point of View, in the Dioceses of the Upper Rhine, Tübingen, 1840. By the * *same*, Historical Essays on the Eccl. Province of the Upper Rhine, Tübingen, 1863. *Buss*, Authentic History of National and Territorial Churchism, p. 813 sq. † *Brück*, The Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Mentz, 1868. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., "Reflections on the Eccl. and Polit. Situation of Baden." *Gams*, l. cit., T. I., p. 405–472.

By the act of secularization of 1803, the accession of Catholic subjects to the Protestant governments of *Würtemberg* and *Baden* was so considerable as to form in the former country one-third, and in the latter two-thirds of the entire population. But the rights of Catholics were not on this account more respected. As in Prussia and Bavaria, so also here the Church was fettered by edicts of religion and special ordinances, thus subjecting her to the vexatious control of a State bureau. For example, by an order of the government of Würtemberg, dated March 20, 1803, every ecclesiastical document published after that date should bear at the head of it the words "*By royal authority*," to the end, it was said, "that the clergy might feel secure." This order was renewed on the 11th of June following, and all persons infringing it declared liable to severe punishment. Again, on the 2d of March, 1805, it was decreed "that all dispensations from fasting given by the bishop and all ecclesiastical documents whatever should bear the *placet* of the government; that no feast or divine service of any kind should be celebrated in the churches on any day except Sundays; and that on week-days labor should take the place of church-going." The *crown* was declared to have the *right of appointment to ecclesiastical benefices*, which were in consequence disposed of by a Royal Ecclesiastical Council, before which candidates for position were to make competitive examinations. This Council had also complete control of studies, and *all petitions for dispensations from the impediments to marriage* had to be submitted to it. The property, both movable and real, of the monasteries was, here as elsewhere, plundered and squandered; religious were insulted and otherwise ill-treated; and the Catholics of Upper Baden so systematically excluded from all offices of public trust that Napoleon, as Protector of the Rhenish Confederation, sent a threatening note to the Badish government, protesting against the policy "of shutting out Catholics and the inhabitants of the countries recently annexed to Baden from participation in public affairs and offices of State," and complaining "that Mannheim, Freiburg, and other important towns had been stripped of institutions which were of a character to contribute to their prosperity and splendor." It is hardly necessary to add that the note received immediate attention. The Grand Duke *Charles Frederic* nominated *Baron von Andlaw*, a zealous Catholic, his Minister of the Interior, in March, 1810. The *ecclesiastical* authorities, presiding over the Catholics of the newly-annexed territories, resided at *Constance*, *Würzburg*, and *Bruchsal*.

The Vicar-General, von Wessenberg, lived at Constance, of which he was subsequently appointed Coadjutor by Archbishop Dalberg. While many of his measures were beneficial, others were extremely injurious to the interests of the Church, and drew forth complaints, not alone from the Pope (February,

Hosted by Google

1810), but also from the government of Freiburg and the King of Würtemberg himself. To correct the harm done in his kingdom by von Wessenberg, the king published a decree in 1811, stating "that owing to the arbitrary measures of the clergy of the second rank, who, by abolishing the Latin language in the divine service, had spread discord from village to village, destroyed uniformity of worship, and unsettled the consciences of the people, he ordered that the Latin language should be retained where it was still used, and restored where it had been discontinued, and that no change should be made in ancient rites and established customs." [1] Von Wessenberg, however, was still in a position to do harm. His influence was all-powerful in the *Permanent Catholic Commission*, established at Carlsruhe in 1803, which in 1812 was changed into the *Department for Catholic Worship*, and among whose ecclesiastical members were *Brunner*, a Catholic of advanced views, and *Haeberlein*, an advocate of the abolition of clerical celibacy. After the death of George Charles of Fechenbach, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, that portion of his diocese lying within the territory of Baden was transferred in 1808 by Archbishop Dalberg to the jurisdiction of the Vicar-General of Bruchsal. Here, as in Bavaria, *Napoleon* secretly interfered to prevent the erection of bishoprics, which the governments of Baden and Würtemberg, acting in good faith, contemplated establishing in 1807 and 1808. He also objected to the presence of the Nuncio, *della Genga*, in Germany, and prevailed upon the Pope to send him to Paris. As early as the 12th of September, 1807, *Count de Champagny*, Minister to the Emperor, sent a peremptory note to Cardinal Caprara, stating "that the Emperor, as Protector of the Rhenish Confederation, must necessarily take an interest in the religious affairs of that great country;" "that he therefore desired to have the negotiations for the Concordat with Germany carried on under his own eyes at Paris;" and he added, with simulated sorrow, that the Emperor was not a little grieved to know "that the Pope had given no attention to the complaints of the churches of Germany, which for the last ten years he had wholly neglected." The fact was that, owing to the supremacy of the State, the intense bigotry of the Protestants, who were at the head of affairs, and von Wessenberg's betrayal of the true interests of religion, the Catholic Church had been as nearly ruined as it well could in the Grand Duchy of Baden.

In *Würtemberg*, thanks to the solicitous care of King Frederic, *Ellwangen* was made the residence of a Vicar-General, and Francis Charles, Prince of Hohenlohe, Bishop of Tempe, was appointed to that office in 1812. With the consent of Archbishop Dalberg, that portion of the diocese of Augsburg lying within the territory of Würtemberg was cut off from his province, a division which the Holy See finally sanctioned (March 21, 1816). About the same time, that is, October 30, 1812, a *Catholic University* was founded at Ellwangen, which, however, the Catholic students of divinity of Würtemberg were alone permitted to frequent. Some time later, in 1817, it was incorporated in the University of Tübingen, under the name of the Faculty of Catholic Theology,

[1] It is proper to say that Archbishop Dalberg had issued a *Pastoral*, during the absence of Wessenberg at the Congress of Vienne, condemning the ordinances of his Vicar-General (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. II., year 1867, pp. 441 sq.)

Hosted by Google

and the residence of the Vicar-General transferred to *Rottenburg*. By the death of the Prince-Primate, *Charles Theodore de Dalberg*, Archbishop of Ratisbon, February 10, 1817, the two sees of Constance and Worms, to which the Catholics of the Grand Duchy of Baden and the Kingdom of Würtemberg were subject, fell vacant, thus giving rise to fresh difficulties for the Catholics of these countries. It was now determined to put an end to the unsettled state of affairs, and accordingly representatives from the *Protestant governments* of Würtemberg, Baden, the two Hesses, Nassau, Mecklenburg, the Duchies of Saxony, Oldenburg, Waldeck, Lübeck, Bremen, Frankfort, and Hamburg met at *Frankfort-on-the-Main*, March 24, 1818, to take steps toward an arrangement with the Holy See. Judging from the opening speech of *Baron von Wangenheim*, the representative from Würtemberg, in which the attitude of the Protestant princes toward the Pope was clearly indicated, the Catholics began to fear that no good would come of the Conference. Their suspicions were fully borne out by the subsequent proceedings of the Conference, which adopted as the *basis* of negotiations with the Holy See the principles set forth in the Punctuation of Ems and the establishment of a *National Church in Germany*. The conditions of the Conference, which were embodied in a document bearing the title of *Magna Charta Libertatis Ecclesiae Catholicae Romanae*, and presented by the representatives from Würtemberg and Baden, were declined by the Holy See. Negotiations were again opened at Frankfort, and fresh proposals sent to Rome, which resulted in the publication, August 16, 1821, of the bull *Provida solersque* by Pius VII., providing for the establishment of the *Archbishopric of Freiburg* and the suffragan sees of *Rottenburg*, *Mentz*, *Fulda*, and *Limburg*.[1] Relying upon the wisdom of the princes, whose interests were at stake, the Pope had entertained hopes that some understanding might be arrived at relative to other questions, on which no definite action had yet been taken. He was at first disappointed, and there were indications that what had already been accomplished might be again undone. This uneasiness arose from the fact that he could not grant canonical institution to the candidates selected by the Protestant princes to fill the newly-created sees. One of these, *Baron von Wessenberg*, was particularly objectionable. Having been Coadjutor to Archbishop de Dalberg at Constance, he was elected Vicar-Capitular on the death of that prelate, but Rome, for grave and sufficient reasons, declined to confirm his election (b. March 15, 1817; d. August, 1860).[2]

[1] The bull may be found in the work named at the head of § 397. *Walter*, Fontes juris eccles., pp. 322 sq.

[2] The Holy See would not confirm this election, because the true sentiments of the prelate with regard to the Church had become manifest from the measures adopted by him while Coadjutor of the diocese of Constance. Were demonstrative proof of the suspicions already entertained required, it might be found in Wessenberg's own "History of the Councils of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." A criticism of this history, by *Hefele*, may be found in the Eccl. Paper of South Germany, 1841, nros. 32, 33, and 38. Making every allowance for the author of this work, it is difficult to understand what he means by the assertion that the Jesuits confounded Christianity with the Church, unless that he would prefer Christianity without a Church. See his

Hosted by Google

The truth of the matter was that the Holy See had received information that the candidates had pledged themselves in general terms to adhere to the principles set forth by the State in the *Ecclesiastical Pragmatia*,[1] condemned in Rome in 1819. The negotiations thus abruptly broken off were not resumed again until the pontificate of *Leo XII.*, who, in view of the peculiar circumstances of the country, published on the 11th of April, 1827, the bull *Ad Dominici gregis custodiam*,[2] giving directions as to the mode of electing bishops in future and of giving information concerning the candidates; as to the constitution of chapters and the appointment of their members; as to seminaries and free intercourse with Rome; and, finally, as to the exercise of episcopal rights. In consequence of this bull, *Bernard Boll, the first Bishop of Freiburg*, whither the see had been transferred from Constance, became the *first* archbishop and metropolitan of the Province of the Upper Rhine, and as such took possession of the majestic cathedral of Freiburg on the 21st of October, 1827. About eighteen months later, May 19, 1829, the *Bishop of Rottenburg* was similarly installed in his see. It had been agreed that the relations of Church and State, *the provisions for their harmonious action*, the degree of *supervision to be exercised by the civil authority over the Church*, and the manner of *protecting* her spiritual interests should be arranged by the *common* consent of the government interested; but they withheld the publication of the ordinance relating to these affairs until after the Pope had appointed to the five vacant sees. After much discussion and the requiring and giving pledges on both sides, these appointments were finally made; and on the 30th of January, 1830, an ordinance embracing *thirty-nine articles*[3] was published, in which was reproduced the *Ecclesiastical Pragmatia*, already condemned by the Pope, which deprived the Church of every shred of real freedom, and subjected all her acts to the inspection and *placet* of the police. *Baron von Hornstein* made an able argument against the ordinance in the Chamber of Würtemberg, showing conclusively that its articles were cruelly unjust and prejudicial to the interests of the Church. Pope *Pius VIII.* also protested, rebuking the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine for keeping silent, when they should have spoken out, declaring, like the Apostles, that they must obey God rather than man.[4] The worst apprehensions of both the Catholics and the Roman

work, Vol. IV., p. 377. For the history of his episcopate, see "Essay on Catholicity in the Grand Duchy of Baden," pp. 30 sq. (NOTE OF FRENCH TR.)

[1] The Ecclesiastical Pragmatia for the Eccl. Province of the Upper Rhine, with notes by *L. Wolf*, Würzburg, 1823. *Gams*, l. c., Vol. IV., pp. 412 sq.

[2] This bull is given in *Walter*, Canon Law, Fontes juris ecclesiastici, pp. 335 sq.

[3] They are found, *ibid.*, p. 340 sq., and in the *Tübing. Quart. Review*, 1830, pp. 162 sq.

[4] It is said in the Brief addressed to the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine (*Walter*, Fontes, p. 345; *Tüb. Quart. Review*, 1830, p. 787): "Vestrum enim omnino erat ea sedulo praestare, quae tanta verborum gravitate Paulus Apost. Timotheo discipulo suo et ejus persona Episcopis omnibus inculcat, cum ait: Praedica verbum, insta opportune, importune, argue, obsecra, increpa in omni patientia et doctrina, etc. . . . Tu vero vigila, in om-

Hosted by Google

Pontiff were more than verified, for the very men who had conceived, drawn up, and caused the publication of the ordinance were now intrusted with its execution. By this arrangement the Church was made in some sort a branch of the ministry of the interior and of worship, and, as a consequence, ecclesiastical dignitaries were little more than civil functionaries, dependent upon the administrative authority. In this way the Church in the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine was stripped of all freedom and deprived of all independence.[1] From having been a patron, the State now became an oppressor of the Church, and so tyrannical were its acts that Archbishop Boll, one of the most peaceful and tolerant of men, was forced, as his life drew to a close, to resign the government of his diocese. He had in vain petitioned the ministry and besought the Grand Duke to have certain professors, appointed by government, removed from their positions, because of their false teaching. One of these, *Reichlin-Meldegg*, represented the history of the Church as a romance, and denied the divinity of Christ, while giving a course of lectures on *Catholic* theology at the University of Freiburg;[2] and another, *Schreiber*, the professor of moral theology at the same place, assailed the prerogatives of virginity, and argued against the obligation of priestly celibacy.

That the religious controversy, which originated in Prussia in 1837, and spread thence over the whole Catholic world, should have been taken up in a country whose faith had been so ably defended by the immortal *Moehler*, was not only natural, but, under the circumstances, necessary. Although the Church in Würtemberg was *less free*, and, in the matter of *mixed marriages*, more embarrassed than even in Prussia, she was not wholly without hope and comfort. Among the younger clergy, particularly, there began to appear signs of a reaction against the claims of the government to interfere in spiritual affairs (*jus in sacra*). When an order from the government appeared, requiring the removal of all priests who refused to celebrate marriages according to the instructions of the law of 1806, by which both parties were placed on a precisely equal footing, *Bishop Keller of Rottenburg*, an old and tried servant of the government, was ordered to bring in a bill in the Lower Chamber (November 13, 1841), demanding the recognition of the *right of the Church to govern herself*—a right guaranteed her by the constitution.[3] The bishop, in his

---

nibus labora, opus fac Evangelistae, ministerium tuum imple. Vestrum erat, vocem tollere pastoralem, ita ut errantium castigatio esset simul fraeno ac timori vacillantibus, juxta illud ejusdem Apostoli: Peccantes coram omnibus argue, ut et caeteri timorem habeant. Denique Vestrum erat, exemplum imitari Apostolorum, qui silentium indicentibus evangelica libertate responderunt: Obedire oportet Deo magis, quam hominibus."

[1] Cfr. *The Catholic*, 1839, February number, p. 147–159.

[2] *Ketteler*, Bishop of Mentz, The Rights and Safeguards of the Catholic Church in Germany, p. 26–31. *Brück*, Ch. H., p. 736. (Tr.)

[3] An enumeration of the chief points in the bishop's *bill* will enable us to estimate how grievously the Church was persecuted. (*The Catholic*, 1842, February number, Supplement, pp. XC. sq.) For the maintenance of the liberty of the Church, he demanded: 1. That the bishop should have the supreme direction and superintendence of his clergy. In virtue of another bill, intro-

Hosted by Google

speech supporting this motion, brought forward the most irrefragable arguments, but to no purpose. The bill was thrown out in both houses; one of the members, in opposing it, saying to his colleagues that they must not mistake the spirit of the age, by which, of course, he meant that the spirit was one of freedom for all—except Catholics. When Professor *Mack*, of the University of Tübingen, and several assistant professors of William's College were dismissed for teaching the Catholic doctrine on mixed marriages, this being the easiest and most convenient way of answering their arguments, the Bishop of Rottenburg († October 17, 1845) again entered his protest against so unwarrantable a proceeding, but was once more unsuccessful.

Again, when Catholic professors of name at the various Universities within the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine would not consent to keep silence, they were peremptorily dismissed. Thus *Riffel*, Professor of Theology at

---

duced on behalf of the government by *von Jaumann*, Dean of the Cathedral and an ex-member of the notorious Frankfort Commission, this direction was limited so as to imply no more than a zealous watchfulness. If, for example, an ecclesiastic was to be suspended, the suspension must come *first* from an Ecclesiastical Council, and *next from his ordinary*. The bill demanded: 2. That the manner of conferring benefices should be corrected, as in no other country was so great a disregard shown for the principles of the Church in this matter. 3. That the bishop should have the administration of all ecclesiastical property and contingent resources of the Church, an affair with which the Ecclesiastical Council had dealt in the most summary manner. 4. That deaneries should be visited only by the bishop or those whom he deputed, and not, as was the custom, by one commissioner representing the bishop and another the government. 5. That since the Catholic Church, although tolerating mixed marriages, had always regarded them with less favor than even the Protestant, her ministers should not be compelled to give the marriage blessing in assisting at them, because, inasmuch as they acted from religious motives, to employ compulsion would be to violate both the principles of religious freedom and the letter of the constitution. 6. That the Ecclesiastical Council should have no recognized inquisitorial rights over the clergy, and that its acts should receive no recognition, even when confirmed by superior authority, unless they had been first submitted to the proper officials of the diocese and obtained their approbation. 7. That, inasmuch as the Church had a right to manage her own affairs and govern herself, and had given the bishop complete control over his seminary, he alone should be the judge of the qualifications of candidates coming up for orders. 8. That the right claimed by the government to censure works of Catholic theology should be given up, as it was regarded as shamefully oppressive, not alone by the Catholic clergy, but by all literary men; that since the Protestants had a free press, so also should the Catholics, and that this could not be denied them on the ground of either intellectual or moral abuse of the privilege, because, among Catholic publicists, to abuse the press would be to commit commercial suicide. 9. That it should be the office of the bishop to pass upon the qualifications of one who was to preach the word of God by making him undergo at the episcopal residence a public examination, previously to conferring upon him the benefices of the Church.

Hosted by Google

the University of *Giessen*, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, having commenced to discuss the origin of the Reformation, after he had got on a little way, was retired by the government, this being a most efficient way of stopping a man's mouth whose arguments are disagreeably embarrassing.[1] In the Upper Chamber of Würtemberg, however, there seems to have been still some sense of justice left, for on the 6th of June, 1842, a motion was put and carried providing that an address should be sent to the king, praying him to have the relations of the Catholic Church and the civil power definitely and *equitably* settled.[2] Still the government was tardy; justice came slowly; and it needed the stimulus of new events to hasten fresh concessions.

The condition of affairs in Baden was no better. Archbishop *Boll* died in 1836, and his successors, *Demeter* and *Vicari* (from 1842), renewed the complaints and protests of their predecessor, but to no purpose. To the hostility of the bureau of administration was now added the opposition of the Chambers, which, in a freak of eccentric liberalism, advocated the abolition of the celibacy of the clergy. This movement, however, was not altogether new. As far back as 1828 a number of lay professors of the University of Freiburg, more zealous than wise,[3] sent memorials to the States General and the Grand Duke of Baden, asking the co-operation of both in abolishing celibacy among the Catholic clergy. Some time later, *Dominic Kuenzer*, rector of the church attached to the hospital at Constance, formed an association with this avowed object, but including in its scope many other ecclesiastical reforms of a kindred nature, and, when admonished by his superiors to dissolve it, was supported in his disobedience by the Department of Worship at Carlsruhe, and *encouraged to threaten them with the vengeance of the Chambers if they persisted* (1839).

The Grand Duke Leopold did all he could toward ameliorating the condition of the Church by acts of a personal nature, such as appointing men of sound Catholic principles to professorships in the Theological Faculty of the University of Freiburg, and building a theological seminary (1842); but his efforts were of little avail, as the government contrived in some way to nullify them. Two bills, the one introduced by *Buss* in 1846 and the other by *Hirscher* in 1850, for the repeal of laws limiting the liberty of the Church, were both defeated in the Chambers.

---

[1] *The Catholic*, 1841, December, Suppl., pp. XCII. sq.; 1842, January, Suppl., pp. XXXVII. sq. *Sion*, 1842, April, pp. 46 sq. "The Right of Investigation," in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IX., pp. 158–168.

[2] See the "Circular of the Old Man of the Mountain (which occupied an important place in the debates of the Chambers, Peterfels, June, 1842), addressed to Minister *von Schlayer*," in *The Catholic*, 1842, June, Suppl.

[3] Cfr. *Moehler*, The Memorial in Behalf of the Abolition of Clerical Celibacy, with Three Documents reviewed. (Complete Works of the *same*, Vol. I., p. 177–267.) †* *Bader*, The Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Freiburg, 1860.

Hosted by Google

§ 410. *The Catholic Church in Russia.* (Cf. § 385.)

Persécution et souffrances de l'église catholique en Russie, etc., Paris, 1842; Germ. by *Zürcher*, Schaffh. 1843. *A. Theiner*, The Latest Condition of the Catholic Church of the Two Rites in Poland and Russia, from Catharine II., Augsburg, 1841. A Glance at Russian History (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. V., IX., X., and XI.) **Hefele*, The Russian Church (Essays on Ch. H., Vol. I.) *A. v. Haxthausen*, Researches on the Interior Condition of Russia, Hanover, 1847, 2 pts. Le catholicisme romain en Russie, études historiques par le comte. *Dmitry-Tolstoi*, Paris, 2 vols. *Gams*, l. c., Vol. I., p. 161–172; Vol. III., p. 531–594. *Pichler*, Hist. of the Schism, Vol. II., p. 202 sq. *Philaret*, Hist. of the Church of Russia, 2 vols.

When the Empress *Catharine* (1762–1796) extended her protection to the Jesuits, after the suppression of the Society by Clement XIV., she acted partly from principle, but chiefly from policy; and although she permitted them to retain their colleges in White-Russia, that is, those portions of Poland lying to the east of the Dvina and Dnieper that fell to the lot of Russia in the first partition of Poland, she was not on that account less intolerant of the Catholic Church, for she wrested from her the metropolitan see of Kiev, transferring it to the Schismatical Greeks, and suppressed the Basilian monasteries and the sees in possession of the United Greeks. By the second partition of Poland, in 1793, nearly all the sees of the United Greeks passed under the dominion of Russia, and while Catharine was under pledge (Art. VIII.) to protect the Catholics of both Rites, she was secretly devising means to bring the United Greeks over to the "Orthodox" Greek Church. She was in a large measure successful, for before her death she had already severed seven millions of them from obedience to the Church of Rome.[1]

Paul I. (1796–1801), her successor, was more just toward Catholics. Conjointly with *Litta*, the Apostolic Nuncio, he made arrangements for the reorganization of the Catholic Church in Russia. The measures agreed upon were confirmed by *Pius VI.*, in a bull dated November 15, 1798, by which *Mohilev* was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see, with jurisdiction over all Catholics of the Latin Rite in Russia.

[1] *Jauffret*, Catharine II. et son règne, Paris, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

By the same bull, the United Greeks, against whom the persecutions now ceased, also obtained an ecclesiastical organization, with *Polotzk* as an archbishopric, and *Luzk* and *Brecsz* as suffragan sees.

Alexander I. (1801–1825) was also favorably disposed toward the Catholic Church, as is shown by the fact that he added four assessors from the Church of the United Greek Rite to the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical commission at St. Petersburg. As long as this equitable treatment lasted the number of Catholics of both Rites rapidly increased, notwithstanding the fact that the Russian Archbishops *Platon* and *Methodius* were endeavoring to rouse the passions of the people by their vehement assaults on the Pope; and that the young and gifted *Alexander de Sturdza*, who was most probably in the pay of Napoleon, was doing a similar work beyond the confines of the Russian Empire.[1]

When *Nicholas I.* (1825–1855) ascended the throne he at once returned to the persecuting policy of Catharine II., one of his first acts being to issue an *edict against the sale of devotional works for the United Greeks.*

By a ukase of April 22, 1828, the organization of the United Greeks was abolished, the administration of their Church being placed under the control of the minister of ecclesiastical affairs, and the Roman Catholic metropolitan see suppressed and replaced by an ecclesiastical commission appointed by the *Emperor.* The bishopric of Luzk and many of the Basilian monasteries were also suppressed. A number of these monasteries were permitted to exist as parishes until the year 1832 (January 19), when they also shared the fate of the others, the whole Order being abolished by the Emperor. By *five other ukases*, most skillfully and craftily drawn up, the United Greek Church was shorn of every vestige of freedom. The whole enormity of the plot was not revealed, however, until the culmination of that stupendous act of treason, planned by three bishops, of whom *Joseph Siemazko* was the

[1] Cf. *Pichler*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 310 sq. At page 313 of this work some one is quoted anonymously as saying: "In the Russian Church there is but one dogma, viz., hatred of the Pope of Rome; for the others no one cares a straw."

Hosted by Google

leader, and participated in by thirteen hundred and five ecclesiastics, who, on the 12th of February, 1839, declared, in a document previously drawn up at Polotzk, that they withdrew from obedience of the Church of Rome, and with simulated sincerity begged the Emperor and the Holy Synod to receive them into the fold of the Schismatical Greek Church. Another measure, equally perfidious, was the spreading of a report among the Protestants of the Baltic provinces that such as would apostatize to the Orthodox Establishment should receive the estates of the German landlords.[1] Gregory XVI. loudly protested against the persecutions of the Catholics; but neither his protests, nor his conference with the Emperor Nicholas in Rome,[2] nor the negotiations conducted by his successor have had any material influence in mitigating the persecution inflicted upon Latin and United Greek Catholics by Russia.[3] But, while persecuting at home, the Russian government affected to be the friend of *religious liberty* abroad, and in 1855 and 1877 provoked a most calamitous war, on the ostensible pretext of securing it to the *Greeks resident in Turkey.*

Nicholas died March 2, 1855, and, owing to the disastrous issue of the war, in which France, England, and Sardinia sided with Turkey, his successor, *Alexander II.*, saw the necessity of making many concessions, both political and commercial, to the people of his Empire; but the idea of granting freedom of worship to the Roman Catholics has not yet impressed the Tzar as a necessary or even equitable measure.

[1] Cf. The Roman State Papers on the subject, beginning with the year 1842, in which ninety documents are given.

[2] See § 398, vers. fin.

[3] A Concordat was concluded August 3, 1847, in virtue of which the Latin Church in Russia was reorganized in two provinces. The first, the ecclesiastical province of *Mohilev*, including all the Latin Catholics of the Empire, except those of Poland, comprised the metropolitan, with the six suffragan sees of *Kamieniec*, *Luzk-Zytomir*, *Minsk*, *Samogitia* (residence *Telcze*), *Wilna*, and *Cherson* (residence *Tiraspol*); the second, the province of *Warsaw*, comprised all Russian Poland, the metropolitan, with the six suffragan sees of *Cracow*, *Lublin*, *Podlachia* or *Jarrow*, *Sandomir*, *Seyna* or *Augustova*, *Vladimir-Kalish* or *Cujavia*. The exempt see of *Chelm-Belz* is the last remnant of the once flourishing Ruthenian or United Greek Church of Poland. See *Jacob Neher's* Eccl. Geogr., Vol. II., pp. 433–456. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

§ 411. *His Political Activity.*

Pie IX. Pontif. max. acta, Roma, 3 T. †*Riancey*, Recueil des actes de N. P. S. P. le pape Pie IX. comprenant le texte et traduction des tous les documents officiels, Paris, 1853 sq. †*Margotti*, The Victories of the Church during the First Decade of the Pontificate of Pius IX., transl. fr. the Italian into German by *Pius Gams*, O. S. B., Innsbruck, 1857. * Pius IX. as Pope and King, according to the Acts of his Pontificate, Vienna, 1865. *Louis Veuillot*, Pius IX. a Mirror of Catholic Character (in Germ.), Vienna, 1864. *Hülskamp*, Pope Pius IX., his Life and Works, Münster, 1870. A Life of Pius IX. down to the Episcopal Jubilee of 1877, by Rev. *B. O'Reilly*, New York, 1877.

On the 1st of June, 1846, Gregory XVI. died, while still in the midst of his untiring labors for the good of the Church. As the conclave by which he was elected had been one of the longest, so that which elected his successor was the shortest held for three hundred years, the opening taking place on the 14th, and the closing on the 16th of June. Of the two parties into which the cardinals composing the conclave were divided, that of the *moderate liberals* was the more numerous; and when it became evident that Cardinal Lambruschini, the conservative candidate, had no chance of being chosen, they united their votes on Cardinal *Mastaï-Ferretti.*

Giovanni Maria Mastaï-Ferretti was born at Sinigaglia, in the States of the Church, May 13, 1792. He was originally enrolled by the French as one of the Italian guard, but being subsequently exempted he entered the priesthood. Having labored for some time in Rome, he was sent by Leo XII., in 1823, as "auditor" of the Apostolic Delegate to Chili. He was appointed Archbishop of Spoleto in 1827, and transferred to the see of Imola in 1832. Notwithstanding his well-known liberal political views, he was appointed by Gregory XVI. cardinal, Dec. 14, 1840, in recognition of the eminent services he had rendered to the Church, and when called to the Papacy was one of the youngest members in the College. As Pope, he took the name of *Pius IX.*, and his accession was hailed with universal and sincere joy by the Roman people. The words uttered by him on the day of his coronation, June 21, *Oggi comincia la persecuzione* (To-day persecution begins), were prophetic. His pontificate, which

Hosted by Google

is the longest in the history of the papacy, having now lasted close upon thirty-two years, has been filled with events the most momentous and various, and marked by sufferings and persecutions of every kind. During it an unceasing struggle has been kept up against both the principles and the workings of the Revolutionists.

It may be conveniently divided into *three parts*:

I. The *first*, extending from June 16, 1846, to April 12, 1850, includes the amnesty and the political reforms in the States of the Church, the Revolution of 1848, the flight of the Pope to Gaëta, and his return to Rome.

II. The *second*, extending from 1850 to 1859, includes what this Pope has done to forward the interests and increase the glory of the Church in the various countries of the world.

III. The *third*, beginning with the invasion and plunder of the States of the Church by Sardinia (1859), and coming down to the present day, includes the trials and persecutions endured by the papacy, which, though severe and numerous, were instrumental in working out a process of purification among Catholics generally.

Men of earnestness and sincerity, the world over, have given comfort to the Head of the Church and glory to the Catholic name by their uncompromising loyalty and unbounded devotion to the principles of their faith. As to the rest, their open defection now from the Catholic Church only shows that they had long since interiorly apostatized. They go out from us because they are not of us, and naturally they swell the ranks of the persecutors of the Church.

Inasmuch as Gregory XVI. had not at the time of his death carried out in his States the social and political reforms recommended to him by the Great Powers in their *Memorandum* of 1831,[1] Pius IX. felt that, to avert from the Holy See the dangers that menaced it, there was a call upon him to give his immediate attention to these hitherto neglected branches of the pontifical government. His natural tenderness of heart, as well as the pacific character of his office of

[1] Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, in several articles of Vols. 43 and 44, and *Augsburg Univ. Gazette*, 1849, in the Supplements to Nos. 236 and 237.

Hosted by Google

Sovereign Pontiff, prompted him to begin with an act of *amnesty*, more extensive than had been granted for many years, and designed as a measure of conciliation. Thousands who had languished in prison were restored to their families and to the pursuits of active life.

The concessions made by Pius IX. at this time were so extensive, and followed each other in such rapid succession, that many began to take alarm, fearing that the Pontiff was acting from the impulses of his own generous nature, rather than from the dictates of political prudence. These concessions contained in themselves the elements of a political constitution, which, it was ardently hoped, would soon take definite shape, and be made the basis of a popular government. Commissions were appointed to reform the system of administration and to revise the laws; a new Council of State, consisting of younger prelates, was named; and Cardinal *Gizzi*, who was universally regarded as belonging to the liberal school of politics, was made Secretary of State. A large number of *laymen* were called to take office in the Civil Service; the press was made more free; and charters for constructing *railways* were granted. These reforms created a feeling of uneasiness in the minds of a few far-seeing men, but by the great bulk of the Italian people they were hailed with acclamations of joy. The cry, "*Evviva Pio Nono*" ("Long live Pius IX."), went up from one end of Italy to the other, and even Protestant Europe gave expression to its sentiments of approval in a *Hymn to Pius the Ninth*.

It soon became evident, however, that these ample concessions, so generously made, neither satisfied the demands nor conciliated the affections of a large number of restless and revolutionary spirits. The *Reduci*, or Radicals, returning from prison and exile, at once set busily to work to overthrow every support of order in both Church and State. And when, in 1848, inspired by the events that had taken place in France, the inhabitants of nearly every city of Italy, from Lombardy to Sicily, rose in rebellion, the Radicals of Rome concluded that their time for action had also come. Demonstrations were held and every means employed in any way calculated to excite and influence the passions of the people. The Pope

Hosted by Google

was pressed to make still larger concessions, as, for example, to expel the Jesuits from Rome. Under pretense of doing him honor, it was attempted to make him an instrument in the hands of the Mazzinists, to force him to declare war against Austria, and to place him at the head of a "crusade" of all Italy, the object of which was to free the country from foreign domination. A new Constitution had been granted March 14, 1848; a reform ministry had been appointed; and two Chambers had been established; the one to regulate the taxes, and the other to pass laws; but the malcontents were by no means satisfied. They still continued to incite the people to rebellion, and, because the Pope declined to make war on Austria, sought to strip him of every vestige of authority, forcing upon him the revolutionary ministry of *Mamiani.*

In vain did Pius IX. recommend (March 31) moderation to the Italians; in vain did he remind them, in an allocution dated April 29, "that, as the Father of all Christendom, he could take no part in the quarrels of political factions, and that his only wish was to secure peace to the entire world, but, above all, to Italy." The demagogues, who had but recently spoken of him in terms of enthusiastic admiration, now used toward him only expressions of reproach and hatred.

The Pope was now obliged to dismiss the Mamiani ministry, and after appointing several others, each of which proved unequal to the task of administering public affairs, he placed at the head of the government *Count Rossi*, a man of energy and determination, who resolved to take such measures as would effectually restore peace and re-establish public order. He was not spared to carry out his intentions. While ascending the stairway leading to the Apostolic Chancery, on the 15th of November, 1848, to open the Chamber of Deputies, he was assassinated, thus falling a victim to the fury of the revolutionary party.[1] Tumultuous and menacing deputations now presented themselves to the Holy Father, peremptorily

[1] *Hurter*, History of the Assassination of Count Peregrin Rossi, Innsbruck, 1855.

Hosted by Google

demanding the appointment of a democratic ministry, the recognition of Italian nationality, and the continuation of the war against Austria.

Borne down with sorrow, and completely undeceived as to the criminal intentions of the malcontents, Pius IX. resolved to quit the city, and with the aid of Count Spaur, the Bavarian embassador, succeeded in making good his escape to Gaëta, November 24, 1848. Anticipating the issue of events, the bulk of the cardinals had previously left Rome, where a reign of terror had already set in. Rome was forthwith proclaimed a Republic by the Mazzinists and Garibaldians; its inhabitants were intimidated into acquiescence by the hordes of anarchists who flocked thither from all countries; ecclesiastical and private property was seized; and religion and its ministers were made the objects of derision and scorn. On the 9th of February, 1849, the Pope was deposed from his temporal sovereignty by the newly convoked Constituent Assembly, and on the 18th of the same month a law was passed by that body declaring all ecclesiastical property secularized, and confiscating it to the State. Instead of the reign of order, which had been promised, anarchy everywhere prevailed.

The victory gained by *Radetzky* over the Piedmontese, near Novara, on the 23d of March, deprived the Roman Republic of all hope of stability. In response to a call issued by the Pope at Gaëta, requesting the intervention of the Catholic powers, France, although at that time under a republican form of government, sent a considerable army into Italy, under the command of Oudinot, which retook Rome July 3d, and expelled the Revolutionists, commanded by Garibaldi; while in the North the Austrians had occupied the Legations.

The government of the city and that portion of the Papal States now in possession of the French was placed in the hands of Cardinals della Genga, Vannicelli, and Altieri. The Pope, in a note dated Gaëta, September 12, promised both financial and administrative reforms, and on the 18th of the same month published a decree of amnesty. He returned to Rome April 12, 1850. The Diplomatic Corps presented him an address, in which they said: "The return of Your Holiness to your States is hailed by all governments as a favorable

Hosted by Google

augury, and is regarded as an event of unusual importance for the restoration of law and order, which are so essential to the well-being of nations and the maintenance of peace."

Although sincerely grieved at the disappointment of his most cherished hopes, and deeply affected by the ingratitude of his subjects, the Pope, on his return to Rome, manifested a spirit of clemency and love, rather than of anger and resentment. After a short time, the old order of things was restored, both in Rome and throughout the whole of the Papal States, and peace and tranquillity once more reigned. In September a complete ministry was formed, at the head of which the prudent and skillful Cardinal *Antonelli* was placed, under the old title of Secretary of State. The work of Public Instruction was again committed to the Jesuits, who were now returning. Notwithstanding that many reforms had been introduced into the Civil Service and the departments of agriculture and commerce, during the occupation of Rome by the French and of Bologna and Ancona by the Austrians, still the offensive and stereotyped accusation that *priests*, wherever they had any hand in the administration of the government, proved themselves both *arrogant* and *incapable*, was constantly reiterated. The testimony of *Count Rayneval*, the French embassador, who, in a detailed report, based upon public and authentic documents, and written in a calm spirit of judicial fairness, showed conclusively that the "*Papal government gave its subjects no cause to fear any abridgement of their rights*," [1] produced little or no effect, and was powerless to correct the misrepresentations set afloat about the clergy. From the day that *Count Cavour*, the Piedmontese Minister, became the leader of the Revolutionists, the agitation grew daily more alarming. Fresh causes of provocation were given to Austria; a subscription was opened to collect money for the purchase of one hundred cannon, to be placed upon the fortifications of Alessandria, whence they were to belch forth their thunders against the Barbarians; and the residences of

[1] The memorial in Mr. *Maguire's* Rome, Its Ruler and Its Institutions, New York, 1858. *Hergenroether*, The States of the Church since the French Revolution, Freiburg, 1860.

Hosted by Google

the Piedmontese diplomatists, consuls, and agents became everywhere the rendezvous for the disaffected. In the year 1856 Count Cavour and Louis Napoleon drew up a project with regard to the future of Italy, which, however, was to be kept secret until the year 1859, when it was to be carried into execution. On New Year's day of the latter year, Napoleon, in replying to the congratulations of the Diplomatic Body, took occasion to show his hostile designs against Austria and his views with regard to Italy.

War broke out between Austria and Sardinia, the latter supported by the military power of France. After the disastrous issues of the battles of Magenta and Solferino, Austria withdrew her troops from Bologna, Ancona, and the Romagna, which were at once taken possession of by the hostile army, and the papal authorities expelled. On the 18th of March, 1860, the Legations, together with Parma and Modena, were formally annexed to Sardinia; and Tuscany, Naples, and Sicily were later on similarly incorporated. By the Treaty of Zurich, Lombardy was ceded to the newly-created Kingdom of Italy, which, however, was in turn forced to surrender Savoy and Nizza to indemnify France for her services.

Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, now desired to get possession of Umbria and the Marches belonging to the States of the Church; and the Emperor of the French allowed this usurpation to take place in the very presence of an army which he had sent to Italy for the avowed purpose of protecting the Pope and defending his rights. The insignificant Pontifical army, under the command of the gallant Generals *Lamoricière* and *Pimodan*, was also treacherously assaulted by a well-disciplined force, six times its number, and well nigh annihilated, near Castel-Fidardo, Sept. 18, 1860. The Pope was now despoiled of four-fifths of his States, Rome alone and the surrounding territory, with a population of about 700,000 souls, being all that was left to him. Apart from the debt of $11,000,000, which the two invasions had cost the papal government, it was also burdened with the usual expenses of the administration, with no means of paying either, except the scanty resources derived from the remnant of territory that still remained of the Patrimony of Peter. These

Hosted by Google

financial embarrassments gave occasion to an unusual and touching manifestation of loyalty to the Head of the Church by the Catholics of the Christian world, who eagerly took up the Papal Loan, or, if they were not wealthy enough to aid him in this way, contributed generously to the *Peter-Pence* fund,[1] thus providing resources sufficient to enable him to meet all his engagements.

The Revolutionists still continued to threaten the invasion of what remained of the Papal States, demanding that Rome should be made the capital of Italy, and ceaselessly repeating the watchword "*Rome or death.*"

While these events were going forward, the Emperor Napoleon and King Victor Emmanuel signed a treaty at Paris, September 15, 1864, in which it was stipulated that the Italian capital should be transferred from Turin to Florence in the following year; that the King of Italy should see to it that no further attacks were made on what remained of the States of the Church; and that, with the exception of the garrisons in a few frontier towns, the French army should be withdrawn from the Papal States within two years. This last stipulation was not fully carried out until December 15, 1866. From the year 1867 until 1870, the only defenders of the Patrimony of Saint Peter were the soldiers of the newly organized Papal army, consisting of about ten thousand men. In the meantime, owing to victories gained by Germans over Germans, on the battle-fields of Bohemia, in June and July, 1866, Austria was forced to surrender her claims to Venice, which was forthwith annexed to the Kingdom of Italy. The Garibaldian campaign against Rome, opened in October, 1867, had a most disastrous issue, the invaders being completely defeated at Mentana, November 3.

Notwithstanding that the Italian kingdom had received so many and so considerable accessions to its territory, and was to all appearances united, it was, nevertheless, both financially and politically, in a most deplorable condition. In spite of the enormous sums realized from the sale of confiscated

[1] Cf. The Peter Pence of Nineteenth Century (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. 45 and 46).

Hosted by Google

Church property, the government was threatened with bankruptcy; disorder reigned in every branch of the administration; and officials were corrupt, dishonest, and incapable. Moreover, civil marriage, which was made obligatory by a law of January 1, 1865, was by no means calculated to check the course of existing evils, or to purify the rapidly decaying morals.

In allocutions, published September 26, 1859; June 13 and December 17, 1860, and September 30, 1861, Pius IX. remonstrated "that virgins consecrated to God should be obliged to beg their bread; that God's temples should be plundered and changed into dens of thieves, and the property of the Church confiscated; and that ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction should be disregarded and usurped, and the laws of the Church contemned and trampled under foot." But neither his complaints nor his menaces produced the least effect. Things went on as before. True, Victor Emmanuel did send *Vegezzi* to Rome in 1864 and *Tonello* in 1867, to open negotiations with the Holy See, but their mission was productive of no results, if we except the provisions for diminishing the number of bishoprics, and down to the present hour no definite understanding has been arrived at between the Pope and the Italian government. While there were formerly eighty-two bishoprics in the States of the Church and twenty-four archiepiscopal and seventy-eight episcopal sees in Sicily and the Kingdom of Naples, there were to be now only about eighty in the whole of Italy. Moreover, convents of men were to be abolished, and the number of the clergy largely reduced. But if the persecution endured by the Italian clergy was hard and relentless, it was not wholly unproductive of good. It purified their lives, strengthened their faith, and rekindled their zeal. Repeating the words of the Holy Father, who was their pattern in virtue and their guide in politics, each of them said: "*I may become the victim of the Revolution, but I shall never be its accomplice.*" A few, but only a few, of the clergy, among the best known of whom were Cardinal d'Andrea, Bishop Caputo, and Father Passaglia, went over to the camp of the enmies of the Church. The *Armonia* and the *Unità Cattolica*, both published at Turin, and the *Civiltà Cattolica*, formerly

Hosted by Google

published at Rome, but since 1871 at Florence, then as now courageously and persistently defended the rights of the Church, and never ceased to warn the faithful against the designs of men who treacherously promise "*a Free Church in a Free State.*"

§ 412. *Energy Displayed by Pius IX. in Ecclesiastical Affairs.*

The political conflicts and persecutions that have disturbed the long pontificate of Pius IX. have not prevented him from displaying a most marvelous energy in ecclesiastical affairs throughout the whole of the Christian world.

On the 9th of November, 1846, he addressed an encyclical letter to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the Catholic world, in which he clearly pointed out the most dangerous errors of the times, adding that, as it was the special office of the *Church* to correct these, so was she *alone* competent and able to do so, provided only her pastors were vigilant and earnest. Up to the year 1877 he had raised twenty-four bishoprics to the dignity of archiepiscopal sees; had established five new archbishoprics, one hundred and thirty bishoprics, and three privileged abbacies (*nullius dioeceseos*); and had created three apostolic delegations, thirty-three apostolic vicariates, and fifteen apostolic prefectures.[1] It is said that he contemplates establishing several new sees in America. He has also given special attention to the *Churches of the Oriental Rite*, establishing (Jan. 6, 1862), an Eastern branch of the Propaganda, consisting of nine cardinals, one for each of the various nations, fifteen consultors, and a cardinal prefect. The first to hold the office of Cardinal prefect for the Eastern branch of the Propaganda was the Cardinal *Reisach*.[2]

By a bull, dated September 24, 1850, he re-established the *episcopacy in England*, thus restoring the *Catholic hierarchy* to that country, and abolishing the apostolic vicariates which had hitherto existed there. By a second bull, dated Novem-

[1] There is a rumor that the hierarchy will be restored to Scotland in 1878. Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 5-12; and *La Gerarchia Cattolica* for 1877, p. XV. (Tr.)

[2] Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 169–186.

Hosted by Google

ber 19 of the same year, he authorized the twelve bishops and the Archbishop of Westminster, constituting the English hierarchy, to establish canonries in their respective cathedral churches.

Similar provisions were made for *Holland* on the 7th of March, 1853. By a bull of July 23, 1847, he re-established the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem, appointing Mgr. Valerga to that dignity, with, however, only the jurisdiction of an archbishop. Pius IX. had hoped that the *concordats* entered into with Russia in 1847; with Tuscany and Spain in 1851; with Costarica and Guatemala in 1852; with Austria in 1855; with Würtemberg in 1857; with Baden in 1859; and with Nicaragua and San Salvador in 1861, would be productive of much good; but in this he was in nearly every instance disappointed, either because the concordats were not faithfully executed, or because they were not adequate to meet the wants they were intended to supply.[1]

This Pope has raised quite a number of extra-Italian metropolitans and other distinguished churchmen of the Catholic world to the rank of the cardinalate. The recipients of this honor in FRANCE were: *Giraud*, Abp. of Cambrai (appointed 1847, died 1850); *Dupont*, Abp. of Bourges (1847–59); *d'Astros*, Abp. of Toulouse (1850–51); *Gousset*, Abp. of Rheims (1850–56); *Matthieu*, Abp. of Besançon (1850–75); *Donnet*, Abp. of Bordeaux (1852); *Villecourt*, Bp. of La Rochelle (1853–67); *Morlot*, Abp. of Paris (1853–62); *Billiet*, Abp. of Chambéry (1861–73); *Bonnechose*, Abp. of Rouen (1862); Dom *Pitra*, O. S. B., of Solesme (1863); Lucien *Bonaparte*, a native of Rome (1868); *Régnier*, Abp. of Rennes (1875); *Caverot*, Abp. of Lyons (1877); and Frederic *de Falloux du Coudray* (1877). In BELGIUM: *Deschamps*, C. SS. R., Abp. of Malines (1875). In GERMANY and the AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN MONARCHY: John *de Geissel*, Abp. of Cologne (1850–64); *Sommerau-Beckh*, Abp. of Olmütz (1850–53); John *de Scitowski*, Abp. of Gran (1853–66); Othmar *von Rauscher*, Abp. of Vienna (1855–75); Charles *von Reisach*, Abp. of Munich (1855–69); *Lewicki*, Ruthenian Abp. of Lemberg (1856–58); *Haulik*, Abp. of Agram (1856–69); Gustavus Adolphus, *Prince de Hohenlohe*, the Papal Almoner, a native of Germany (1866); *Tarnoczy*, Abp. of Salzburg (1873–76); *Simor*, Abp. of Gran (1873); *Ledochowski*, Abp. of Gnesen and Posen (1875); J. B. *Franzelin*, S. J., Professor at the Roman College, a native of Germany (1876); *Kutschker*, Abp. of Vienna (1877); and *Mihalovitz*, Abp. of Agram (1877). In SPAIN and PORTUGAL: *Bonnel y Orbe*, Abp. of Toledo (1850–57); Peter Paul *de Figueredo de Cunhã e Mello*, Abp. of Braga (1850–56); Cyril *de Alameda y Brea*, Abp. of Toledo (1858–62); *Tarancon*, Abp. of Seville (1858–62); *Rodriguez*, Patriarch of

[1] Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, pp. 53–84.

Hosted by Google

Lisbon (1858–69); *de la Puente*, Abp. of Burgos (1861–67); Michael *Garcia Cuesta*, Abp. of Compostella (1861–73); Luis *de la Lastra y Cuesta*, Abp. of Seville (1863–76); John Ignatius *de Moreno*, a native of Guatemala, Abp. of Toledo (1868); Mariano *Barrio y Fernandez* (1873–76); *Cardoso*, Patr. of Lisbon (1873); F. P. *Benavides y Navarrete* (1877); Manuel *Garcia Gil* (1877); Michael *Paga y Rico*, Abp. of Compostella (1877). In ENGLAND: Nicholas *Wiseman* (1850–65); Henry Edward *Manning* (1875), Archbishops of Westminster; and Mgr. *Howard* (1877). In IRELAND: Paul *Cullen*, Abp. of Dublin and Primate of Ireland (1866). And in the UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA: John *McCloskey*, Abp. of New York (1875).[1]

When Pius IX. learned the character of the persecutions endured by the Catholics of Sardinia, New Granada, Mexico, Spain, Switzerland, Russia, Poland, and other countries, he at once published *allocutions* expressing sympathy with the oppressed, and warning their oppressors of the criminal wrong they were doing. He also put an end to the senseless controversy between M. *Gaume* and the *Univers* newspaper, relative to the propriety of teaching the *Pagan Classics* in the education of youth, by declaring in favor of their use.[2] He censured the erroneous teachings of Günther, of Vienna; Frohschammer, of Munich; and Ubaghs, of Louvain; and, by numerous documents, condemned the leading *errors of the present times* concerning science, politics, and social life. But that these errors might be stated more distinctly, and brought home with greater force to men's minds, he commissioned *Cardinal Bilio* to extract them from the numerous documents in which they were separately contained, and to arrange them in a series of propositions. These were eighty in number, classified under ten heads. Such is the history of the famous "*Syllabus of Errors*," which, together with the Encyclical

[1] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, pp. 69–139, and *Civiltà Cattolica* of 1877; also *Catholic Almanac*, pp. 56, 57, New York, 1878. (TR.)

[2] See Epistola encyclica ad Galliarum episcopos, d. d., 21 Martii, 1853. And when, later on, the Sulpicians of Quebec renewed the quarrel, the S. Congregation of the Inquisition, referring to this decision, deprecated, by letter of February 15, 1867, such fastidiousness, saying: "Explorata enim res et antiqua constantique consuetudine comprobata adolescentes etiam clericos germanam dicendi scribendique elegantiam et eloquentiam sive ex sapientissimis SS. Patrum operibus, sive ex clarissimis ethnicis scriptoribus ab omni labe purgatis absque ullo periculo addiscere optimo jure posse." See *Analecta juris Pontificii*, IXe série, col. 767. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Quanta Cura, was sent to all the Catholic bishops of the world, December 8, 1864.[1] The titles of the various heads of the Syllabus are as follows:

I. Pantheism, Naturalism, and Absolute Rationalism.

II. Modified Rationalism.

III. Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism.

IV. Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Bible Societies, Clerico-liberal Societies.

V. Errors concerning the Church and Her Rights.

VI. Errors concerning Civil Society, considered both in itself and in its Relations to the Church.

VII. Errors concerning Natural and Christian Ethics.

VIII. Errors concerning Christian Marriage.

IX. Errors concerning the Civil Power of the Roman Pontiff.

X. Errors concerning Modern Liberalism.

Liturgical questions also claimed a share of the solicitude of Pius IX.

On the 9th of November, 1846, he made provision for the maintenance of the various Oriental liturgies; on the 31st of May, 1850, he raised the Feast of the Visitation of the B. V. M. to a double of the second class; on the 18th of May, 1854, he ordered that the feasts of SS. Timothy, Titus, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, should be celebrated throughout the Church in the lesser double rite; he declared St. Hilary of Poitiers (*Pictavium*) in 1851, St. Alfonso Maria da Liguori in 1871, and St. Francis de Sales in 1877, *Doctors* of the Church; and, finally, in December 8, 1870, he proclaimed St. Joseph, Spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Patron of the Universal Church, and raised his feast to the rank of the first class. No former Pope *beati-*

[1] Sanct. D. N. Pii IX. epist. encyclica die VIII., Dec., 1864, una cum Syllabo praecipuorum aetatis nostrae errorum et actis Pontificis, ex quibus excerptus est syllabus, Ratisbonae, 1865. Out of the numerous *Commentaries* on it, we but mention Bp. *Dupanloup*, the Convention of Sept. 15, and the Encyclica of Dec. 8. (In Germ., by *Molzberger*, Würzbg. 1865); (by an Anonymous), Cologne, at Bachem's, 1865; the Pope and Modern Ideas, Vienna, at Sartori's, 1864; Voices of Maria-Laach ,edited by the Jesuit Fathers, Flor. *Riefs*, *Roh*, *Rattinger*, and *Schneemann*, Freiburg (Herder), 1865–67, eight numbers. (Explanation and Defense of the Syllabus.)

Hosted by Google

fied or placed on the catalogue of *Saints* so large a number as Pius IX.[1] On the 10th of December, 1863, he published a decree relative to the veneration of *relics*. This decree, which was called forth by the doubts raised as to whether the *palm-branches* and *blood-stained vessels* found in the Catacombs were to be accepted as certain proofs of martyrdom, did not place the question entirely beyond discussion. It merely declared "that to avoid giving scandal to the faithful, the blood-stained phials are, in the future as in the past, to be respected as tokens of martyrdom, and that the papal decree of 1668, relative to the question, is to be regarded as authoritative." He earnestly besought (May 3, 1848) all priests to celebrate the Holy Eucharist worthily; and in the encyclical *Optime scitis*, dated November 5, 1855, exhorted the bishops of Austria to carefully observe the rubrics of the Pontifical in performing their episcopal functions. By the bull *Quod jam pridem*, of

[1] The following were beatified: *Peter Claver, S. J.;* Venerable *Maria Anna de Paredes; John de Britto, S. J.; John Grande,* of the Order of the Brothers of Charity; *Paul of the Cross,* Founder of the new Congregation of the Passion of Our Lord J. Xt.; Venerable *Germaine Cousin; Andrew Bobola, S. J.;* the martyred parish-priest, *John Sarkander, Canon de' Rossi; Benedict Joseph Labre; John Leonardi,* Founder of the Congr. of Clerics of the Mother of God; *Peter Canisius, S. J.; Margaret Mary Alacoque,* of the Visitation Order; *Mary of the Angels; John Berchmanns, S. J.; Benedict of Urbino; Clement Maria Hofbauer,* C. SS. R., etc., with whom there were, on the Feast of Pentecost of 1867, still associated two hundred and five martyrs of Japan. There were canonized, on the Feast of Pentecost, 9th of June, 1862, in the presence of nearly three hundred bishops, *twenty-six Japanese Martyrs* (twenty-three Franciscans, three Jesuits), and the confessor *Michaël de Santis,* of the Order of Trinitarians. Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, p. 20–43. The last canonizations, on the 29th of June, 1867, the eighteenth centenary celebration of the martyrdom of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, in the presence of five hundred bishops, were those of the Holy Martyr *Josaphat,* Archbishop of Polotzk; of the Holy Martyr *Peter de Arbuez,* Inquisitor of Aragon (against the numerous defamations of Arbuez, cfr. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers,* Vol. LX., p. 854, year 1873); of the *nineteen martyrs of Gorcum,* in Holland; of St. *Paul of the Cross;* of St. *Leonard a Porto-Mauritio;* of St. *Mary Frances,* of the Order of St. Peter of Alcantara and St. *Germaine* Cousin. Cf. *Hausherr, S. J.,* The Grand Celebration at St. Peter's, in Rome, on the 29th of June, 1867, Mentz, 1867, p. 48–108. The Latin biography of the Interpreter *Estius,* giving an account of the martyrs of Gorcum, transl. into German. Warendorf, 1867; *Laforêt,* Rector of the University of Louvain, The Martyrs of Gorcum (in French), German transl., Münster, 1867.

Hosted by Google

September 25, 1863, he prescribed a new office and Mass for the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Pius IX. has summoned the bishops of the world to Rome on *four* different occasions since the opening of his pontificate. On the first occasion, December 8, 1854, above two hundred were present; on the second, June 9, 1862, three hundred; on the third, June 29, 1867, five hundred; and on the last, December 8, 1869, above seven hundred assembled to take part in the proceedings of the Vatican Council. The occasion of the first assemblage was the promulgation as an article of faith of the dogma of the *Immaculate Conception* of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God. As early as the 2d of February, 1849, the Pope had sent the encyclical *Ubi primum* to all the bishops of the Catholic Church, requesting them to express their wishes and opinions on the subject, and to beg the prayers of the faithful for the same object. A *Jubilee* was opened on the 1st of August, 1854, and on the 8th of December following this dogma was solemnly defined during Pontifical High Mass, in the presence of the Sacred College and the assembled bishops, and promulgated by the bull *Ineffabilis Deus*.[1] The proclamation of this dogma was hailed by Catholics everywhere with unwonted expressions of joy, which was witnessed by the numerous statues, columns, and churches erected in every country to the honor of Mary Immaculate.

The bishops were a *second* time called together at Pentecost, 1862, to assist at the canonization of the Japanese martyrs,[2] and to take measures against the violent spoliation of

[1] The definition, which is strictly in accord with the bull of Pope *Alexander VII.* (see p. 431, note 1), runs thus: Declaramus, pronuntiamus et definimus, *doctrinam, quae tenet, Beatissimam Virginem Mariam in primo instanti suae Conceptionis fuisse singulari Omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu Salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpae labe praeservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam.* (Pii IX. P. M. acta, T. I., p. 616.) Cf. De immaculato B. V. M. conceptu, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit, ed. *Perrone*, S. J., Rom. 1853; ed. *Passaglia*, S. J., Rom. 1854. Cf. Pius IX. as Pope and King, p. 12–20.

[2] See pp. 405, 406.

Hosted by Google

the States of the Church. Previously to this time, numerous addresses, followed by thousands of signatures, had been sent from all parts of the world to the Holy Father, demanding the restoration of the States of the Church in their entirety, and protesting in the most emphatic terms against any future attempts upon them.[1] The bishops assembled at Rome also presented an address, thanking the Pope, in the name of all Catholics, for the determined stand he had made against lawless violence, and expressing their conviction that the Civil Power was *necessary* to the Holy See, to which it had been annexed by a special and visible providence of God. And they did not hesitate to repeat the words used by the Pope on the previous 25th of March, declaring that in the *actual* order of things the Civil Power was an *indispensable* requisite to the *free* government of the Church; that the Head of the Church of God could not be the subject of any prince; that he must enjoy the fullest independence in his own territory and in his own States; and that in no other way could he protect and defend the Catholic faith and guide and govern the whole Christian commonwealth. In remembrance of that eventful assemblage, the Holy Father presented each bishop with a copy of that grand memorial of Catholic unity, "*La sovranità temporale dei Romani Pontefici, propugnata nella sua integrità dal suffragio dell' orbe Cattolico regnante Pio IX.*" (Roma, 1860 sq.), containing the unanimous protests against the spoliation of the Patrimony of St. Peter, sent to Rome from the various countries of the world—from Italy and France; from Belgium and Switzerland; from Austria, Germany, and Holland; from Spain and Portugal and their dependencies; from England and Scotland; from Ireland and North America; from Turkey and Poland; and from India, China, and Oceanica.[2]

[1] Cfr. *Schroedl*, The Verdict of Catholicism and its Confirmation by the whole Catholic World on the Importance and Necessity of the Civil Power and Sovereignty of the Holy See, Freiburg, 1867. In Pt. II., pp. 117–174, History of the Formation of the States of the Church. *Wiseman*, Rome and the Catholic Episcopate at the Feast of Pentecost, 1862 (transl. into Germ. by *Reusch*, Cologne, 1862). *A. Niedermayer*, The Feast of Pentecost in Rome in 1862.

[2] The work consists of six vols., fol.

Hosted by Google

The bishops gathered around the throne of Pius IX. for the *third* time, on the 29th of June, 1867, to celebrate the *eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the Princes of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul*, and to assist at the canonization of a large number of *martyrs*.

In giving expression to the feelings of joy that filled his heart at seeing gathered about him so many bishops, who, in obedience to his summons, had hastened to Rome with joyous alacrity from the farthest corners of the earth, Pius IX. spoke substantially as follows: Nothing, said he, could be more imposing than this assemblage, in which are gathered together representatives from every country of the Catholic world, to celebrate the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the Princes of the Apostles; nothing could be more admirable than this illustration of the unity of the Catholic Church on the occasion of the canonization of martyrs, who shed their blood in defense of the Holy See and of the Catholic faith. Beholding this exemplification of the unity of the Catholic Church, her enemies will begin to appreciate her vast energies, and be forced to confess that in proclaiming her decrepit and effete they had been deluded. There can be no question but that if the bishops remain cordially united with the head of the Church, her influence and power will go on increasing from day to day. I ardently hope that at some future day I may be again able to gather you all about me to take part in an *Ecumenical Council*.

The Holy Father also delivered an address in the Hall of Consistory to the *priests*, some ten thousand in number, who had come to Rome to witness and assist at the solemnities of the Centenary. His manner was earnest and impressive, and his language simple and touching. He warned them never to lose sight of the fact that they were clothed with the dignity of the priesthood; to offer worthily every day the Most Holy Sacrifice, both for their own salvation and for that of all mankind; to be always conspicuous for austerity of manners, for purity and chastity of life, but, above all, for knowledge of the sacred sciences, that they might thus be able to battle valiantly against the enemies of the human race, to advance the glory of God, to secure the salvation of souls, and to prove themselves obedient subjects of their bishops and worthy soldiers of Jesus Christ. He finally gave them his blessing, commissioning them to give it in turn to their flocks in his name.

A deputation, consisting of fifteen hundred persons, and *representing one hundred cities of Italy*, presented the Pope with a splendid album, in which were inscribed the names of the Hundred Cities, followed by the signatures of their inhabitants still loyal to the Holy See. The presentation was made by Count Clodio Boschetti, of Modena, who, in his address, assured the Pope that the Italian people were not hostile to him or alienated from him; that, on the contrary, they bore him reverence and love; that they were especially grateful to him for the stand he had made against the enemies of the Church, and recognized in his attitude the firmness of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

In reply, the Pope said: "I see yonder (he pointed to the Castle of St. Angelo) the angel sheathing his sword, after having put to flight the powers of evil. Thus did he announce to the people in time past and on this very day the

Hosted by Google

cessation of a pestilence. I see him again to-day putting up his sword at God's bidding, for to-day marks the beginning of the season of mercy. On this day, at the opening of the present century, one of my predecessors was forced from his throne and driven into exile. Those who were his enemies and persecutors were the same who to-day, under the cloak of patriotism, are endeavoring to root out our holy religion from the hearts of men. On this day, too,—for the vigil is already begun—July 2, 1849, did a liberating army enter the Holy City and put to flight the enemies of God and of His Church, who desired to abolish the reign of Christ in Rome itself, in the very heart of Catholicity. This day has been regarded as fatal to Rome; but I say that the hour of triumph has already dawned. It has been said that I hate Italy. No, I do not hate her. I have always loved her, always blessed her, always sought her happiness, and God alone knows how long and ardently I have prayed for her. Yes, let us all pray, if I must say so, for this unhappy nation. A nation held together by selfishness can never be united. There can be no blessing on unity if justice and charity be sacrificed; if the rights of all, including God's ministers and His faithful people, be trampled under foot. The whole world will cry out against such unity; every one's hand will be raised against it, because God Himself is against it. The hour of triumph gives tokens of its presence, and can not be long delayed; but should it still be necessary to wait the fullness of its coming, let us bear patiently the trials a just God may send upon us."

The *five hundred bishops* assembled at Rome gave expression to their sentiments in an *address* to the Pope, composed by Archbishop *Haynald*, of Calocsa, in which they said that "they had cheerfully obeyed his summons calling them to Rome, in order to have an opportunity to honor his great virtues, to comfort him in the midst of the trials which afflicted the Church, and to renew the strength of their own hearts by gazing upon his fatherly countenance. The Centenary of St. Peter, they went on to say, was a fresh proof to their minds of the unshaken firmness of the Rock upon which Our Divine Savior built the grand and imperishable edifice of His Church. The Chair of St. Peter, after having survived the ceaseless assaults of its enemies for eighteen hundred years, was still the organ of truth, the center of unity, the bulwark of liberty; it had remained at all times unchanged and inviolate, while the thrones of kings and emperors had been overturned and gone to pieces, one after the other, on every side of it. They came, also, impressed with the truth of the convictions and sentiments they had proclaimed five years previously, to show their deep veneration for his person, to give public utterance to their views relative to the maintenance of his Civil Power, the advancement of the cause of religion, and the upholding of the claims of justice, of which he was so intrepid a defender. Their most pleasing, as well as most sacred duty, would be to believe and to teach what he taught and believed; to reject the errors that he rejected; to follow whither he led; to combat at his side; to be ready, like him, to encounter dangers and trials and contradictions. Already they discerned tokens of a brighter future in the unequivocal expressions of attachment to the Holy See that came from every quarter of the Christian world; in the signs of affectionate sympathy manifested by all Christendom, which it would be their pleasing duty to encourage by word and example; in the loyalty of the Romans and their obedience to their sovereign temporal and spiritual

Hosted by Google

Ruler, to which they could personally bear witness; and in the prospective convocation of an *Ecumenical Council*, which, they would say with *Paul IV.*, 'was the best provision possible against the great dangers that threatened Christian society.'"

In *reply*, Pius IX. said that it was a great comfort to him to know that this meeting of the bishops had been the occasion of drawing still more closely together the bonds of charity uniting all the churches of the world. He felt confident that having drunk in the true spirit of the Gospel at the Tombs of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and St. Paul, the Teacher of the Gentiles, they would go back to their dioceses renewed in strength and equipped to do battle against the forces of the enemy; to defend the rights of religion; and to more successfully unite the peoples committed to their charge in the bonds of Christian charity. Like them, he felt persuaded that no power other than the divine power of the Church could make an effectual stand against the evils of the times, and that this power is never more manifest than when all the bishops, summoned by the Pope, *and presided over by him*, are assembled together to treat of the affairs of the Church.

Expression was simultaneously given to similar sentiments, inspired by the promptings of Catholic faith, in every church in Christendom. Catholics the world over, as if prompted by some unseen power and impelled by divine instinct, joined in the religious solemnities of the occasion. The thought that the Catholic Church had existed for eighteen centuries; that after that lapse of time she presented to the world the imposing spectacle of all her bishops gathered in *harmonious unity* about the Tomb and the Throne of Peter, filled the hearts of all with confidence in her ultimate and approaching triumph.[1]

On the 11th of April, 1869, Pius IX. again received at Rome, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination in the priesthood, most affectionate tokens of the reverence and love which his children bore him.[2] On the 23d of August, 1871, when "Pius IX. hath seen the years of Peter," he received still further assurances of the loyalty and devotion of Catholics, which were again renewed on the celebration of his *golden jubilee* as bishop, on the 3d of June, 1877.[3]

[1] Cfr. *Charles Brandes*, O. S. B., St. Peter in Rome, and Rome without Peter; written in honor of the Eighteenth Centenary Jubilee of the Princes of the Apostles, Our-Lady-of-Hermits, 1867. The Pastorals of Abp. *Herman of Freiburg*, The Papacy in History, and of *Martin*, Bp. of Paderborn, "Christianity and the Papacy." *Pius Gams*, O. S. B., The Year of the Martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, Ratisb. 1867. Archbp. *Manning*, The Centenary of St. Peter and the Ecumenical Council (in Germ., Mentz, 1868).

[2] Dr. *de Waal*, Memorial Papers of the Celebration in Rome of the Jubilee of Our Holy Father, and Easter preceding, Münster, 1870. See also *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. LX., p. 63–67.

[3] See *B. O'Reilly*, Life of Pope Pius IX., pp. 467, 469. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

While thus busily engaged in looking after the interests of the Church, the *Great Pontiff* was ever ready *to sympathize with every sorrow, and to assist the afflicted of every land.* Mr. *Maguire*[1] has left us an excellent account of his habit of dispensing *charity* wherever he saw want or suffering. In this he but followed the pattern of his predecessors, who were ever zealous to give aid to all Christian peoples to the full extent of their power. This is indeed as it should be, for to whom should we look for fatherly solicitude if not to those who, as faith teaches, are *the Fathers and Teachers of all Christians?* Faithful to the traditions of his predecessors, Pius IX., on the 26th of March, 1847, asked for *prayers* and *contributions* for poor afflicted Ireland; on the 27th of April, 1859, he had prayers offered up for the speedy restoration of peace between *Italy and Austria, then at war;* on the 29th of July, 1860, while a bloody *persecution* was being waged *against the Maronites* in Syria, and on the 18th of October, 1862, during the continuance of the *Civil War* in the *United States* of North America, he also besought all Christians to implore Heaven for the cessation of both.

Finally, as a patron of *art*, Pius IX. is both zealous and munificent.[2] During his pontificate numerous and valuable treasures have been exhumed at Rome and at Ostia; and while *Garrucci*, *Cavedoni*, *Visconti*, *Borghese*, and others have industriously pushed forward their inquiries in *archaeology*, *de' Rossi* has given to the world his invaluable works on Subterranean Rome.[3] The numerous inscriptions set up in the pontifical museums, and in so many other places in Rome, bear witness to the efforts of Pius IX. in the promotion of art. The encouragement given by him to the publication of the splendid *fac-simile* edition of the Vatican Codex of the Holy Scriptures will serve as an instance of his princely liberality in art, in literature, and the sciences. The various ecclesiastical sciences found able exponents, particularly within

[1] See p. 787.

[2] *Dr. Sighart*, Relics from Rome, being a contribution to the History of Art, Augsburg, 1865, p. 120.

[3] *Roma Sotterranea*, Rom. 1864–67, 2 T., fol.; Inscriptiones Christianae.

Hosted by Google

the States of the Church. In *philosophy* occur the names of *Liberatore*, S. J.; *Tongiorgi*, S. J.; *San-Severino*, *Taparelli*, and *Kleutzgen*, S. J., who combated the ontologistic and traditionalistic systems of *Rosmini* and *Gioberti*. In *dogmatic theology*, *Perrone*, S. J.; *Passaglia*, S. J.; *Franzelin*, S. J., and others.[1] In *moral theology*, *Scavini* and *Ballerini*, S. J. In *exegetics*, *Patrizi*, S. J.; *Pianciani*, and *Vercellone*. In *church history*, *Theiner*, the Oratorian; *Tosti*, the Benedictine; *Tizzani*, formerly professor at the Sapienza; *Cardoni* and *Cecconi*, the present Archbishop of Florence. In *patrology*, Cardinal *Angelo Mai* and *Ceriani*, of Milan. In *pulpit eloquence*, Father *Ventura*, the Theatine; Canon *Audisio*; *Curci*, S. J.; *Cucuzza*, O. P.; and *Luigi da Trento*, the Capuchin. And in *canon law*, Mgr. *Chaillot*, who has written chiefly for the *Analata Juris Pontificii*; *Avanzini*, *Pennacchi*, and *Piazzesi*, the editors of the *Acta S. Sedis*.

§ 413*a*. *The Twentieth Ecumenical Council of the Vatican and its Immediate Consequences.*

I. Works Preceding the Council.

H. E. Manning (Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster), The Centenary of St. Peter and the General Council. A Pastoral Letter, London, 1867. (In favor of Infallibility.) *C. H. A. Plantier* (Bishop of Nimes), Sur les Conciles généraux à l'occasion de celui que Sa Sainteté Pie IX. a convoqué pour le 8 decembre prochain, Nimes et Paris, 1869 (Infallibilist). Mgr. *V. A. Deschamps* (Archbishop of Malines), L'infaillibilité et le Concile général, 2d ed., Paris et Malines, 1869 (strong Infallibilist). *H. L. C. Maret* (Dean of the Theol. Faculty of Paris), Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse, Paris, 1869, 2 vols. *W. Em. Baron de Ketteler* (Bishop of Mentz), The General Council and its Import for Our Times, 2 vols. (Inopportunist; has since given in). *Dr. Jos. Fessler* (Bishop of St. Pölten and Secretary of the Vatican Council, † 1872), The Last and the Next General Councils, Freiburg, 1869. *F. Dupanloup* (Bishop of Orléans), Lettre sur le future Concile Oecuménique, 1869. The *same*, On the Infallibility of the Pope. First against, then in favor of the Dogma. The Pope and the Council, by *Janus*, London, 1869. Written from the liberal (Old) Catholic stand-point; probably the joint production of Profs. Döllinger, Friedrich, and Huber, of the University of Munich. Dr. J. Hergenröther, *Anti-Janus*, Freiburg, 1870; Engl. by *J. B. Robertson*, Dublin, 1870 (Rom. Cath.) Reformation of the Roman Church in its Head and Members, the Problem to be Solved by the Incoming Roman Council, Lps. 1870. (By Prof. *von Schulte*, of Prague.) Liberal Catholic.

[1] See p. 696, note 1.

Hosted by Google

II. Reports During the Council.

The Civiltà Cattolica of Rome for 1869 and 1870 (chief organ of the Infallibilists). *Louis Veuillot*, Rome pendant le Concile, Paris, 1870, 2 vols. Collection of his correspondence to his journal, *l'Univers*, of Paris. (Ultra-Infallibilist.) *J. Friedrich* (Lib. Cath.), Journal of the Vatican Council, Nördlingen, 1871. It notes facts, projects, and rumors as they came to the surface. *Lord Acton* (Lib. Cath.), The Vatican Council. First published in the *North British Review* for October, 1870; pp. 95–120 of the Amer. reprint. *Quirinus*, Letters from Rome on the Council, first in the *Augsburg General Gazette*, and then in a separate volume (Munich and London, 1870, p. 856). Compare against Quirinus, Untruths of the Roman Letters on the Council, in the Univ. Gaz., by *W. Em. Baron de Ketteler*, 1870. Ce qui se passe au Concile, dated April 16, 1870, 3d ed., Par. 1870 (by *Jules Gaillard*). La dernière heure du Concile, Paris, 1870 (by a member of the Council). The last two works were denounced as a calumny by the presiding cardinals, in the session of July 16, 1870. *Pomponio Leto*, Eight Months at Rome during the Vatican Council; tr. from the Italian, London, 1876. (Adverse to the Council.) Also the Reports during the Council, in the *Giornale di Roma*; the Turin *Unità Cattolica;* the London *Times;* the London (Rom. Cath.) *Tablet;* the Dublin *Review;* the New York *Tribune.*

III. The Acts and Proceedings of the Council.

(1.) *Roman Catholic* (*Infallibilist*) *Sources:* Acta et Decreta ss. et oecum. conc. Vaticani, Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1870 sq.; fasc. I., acta *publica* quibus conc. praeparatum est; fasc. II., acta *publica* ipsius concilii. Additum est lexicon dioeceseon residentialium et abbatiarum "*nullius*," et catalogus Praelatorum Eccles. cathol. Acta et Decreta ss. oecum conc. Vatic., Rom. 1872, ex typographia Vaticana. "*The Ecumenical Council*," Voices (Stimmen) of Maria Laach; new series, Freiburg, 1870. A series of discussions (beside documents, reports, and criticisms) in defense of the Council, by Jesuits (*Florian Riess* and *K. v. Weber*). Atti ufficiali del Concilio ecumenico, Torino, 1870. Actes et histoire du Concile oecuménique de Rome, premier du Vatican, publiés sous la direction de *Victor Frond*, Paris, 1869 sq., 8 vols, fol.; includ s extensive biographies of Pope Pius IX. and his Cardinals; of the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, their photographs and autographs; Vol. VIII. contains the Actes, decrets et documents recueillis et mis en ordre par M. *Pellctier*, chanoine d'Orléans. Archbp. *H. E. Manning*, The Vatican Council and its Definitions; a Pastoral Letter to his Clergy, London and New York, 1871. This, together with two other Pastoral letters on the Council, are published in one volume, Petri Privilegium, London, 1871. Bp. *John Fessler*, The Vatican Council; its Course and Import, Vienna, 1871. By the *same*, The True and the False Infallibility of the Popes, *ibid.*, 1871, and New York, 1875. *M. J. Chantrel*, Histoire du concile du Vatican, 2d ed., Paris, 1872. *Conradi* (episcopi Paderbornensis), Omnium concilii Vaticani, quae ad doctrinam et disciplinam pertinent, documentorum collatio, Paderborn, 1873. Dr. *M. J. Schceben*, Periodical Papers, Ratisbon, 1870 sq. *Cecconi* (Archbp. of Florence, the official Historian of the Council), Hist. of the Vatican Council; German, Mentz, 1873; English, with additions, by Card. *Manning*. "The True Story of the Vatican Council," London, 1877;

Hosted by Google

Amer. reprint, in the *Catholic Review* of Brooklyn, 1877. The stenographic reports of the speeches of the Council are to remain locked up in the archives of the Vatican until the death of the last member of the Council.

(2.) *Old Catholic* (*Anti-Infallibilist*): *John Friedrich*, Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870, Noerdlingen, 1871, in 2 parts. Dr. *F. von Schulte* (Professor of Canon Law in the University of Prague, but since 1873 in Bonn), The Infallibility Decree of July 18, 1870, . . . examined, Prague, 1871. Also "The Power of the Roman Popes over Princes, Countries, Peoples, and Individuals, examined by the Light of their Doctrines and their Acts since the Reign of Gregory VII., to serve for the appreciation of their Infallibility, and set face to face with Contradictory Doctrines of the Popes and the Councils of the First Eight Centuries," Prague, 1871. (Refuted by Bp. Fessler's work on the True and False Infallibility). Suffrages of the Catholic Church on the Eccl. Questions of the Day, Munich, 1870 sq. A series of Discussions against the Vatical Council, by *Döllinger*, *Huber*, *Schmitz*, *Friedrich*, *Reinkens*, and *Hötzl*.

(3.) *Protestant:* Dr. *Emil Friedberg* (Prof. of Eccl. Law in Lps.), Collection of the Documents concerning the First Council of the Vatican, with a Sketch of its History, Tübingen, 1872. Very valuable; contains all the important documents and a full list of works (written in France, Italy, Germany, and England) on the Council. This collection, although made with the industry of a bee, is still incomplete. *Theodore Frommann* (of Berlin), Hist. and Criticism of the Vatican Council of 1869 and 1870, Gotha, 1872. *E. de Pressensé* (Ref. Pastor in Paris), Le Concile du Vatican, son histoire et ses conséquences politiques et religieuses, Paris, 1872. *L. W. Bacon*, An Inside View of the Vatican Council, New York, 1872. *Dr. Hase* gives an extensive criticism on the Infallibility decree in the 3d ed. of his *Manual* of Protestant Polemics against the Roman Cath. Church, Lps. 1871, pp. 155–200. Cf. pp. 24–37.

(The above are only the most important works of the large and increasing literature, historical, apologetic, and polemic, on the Vatican Council. *Friedberg* notices, in all, no less than 1,041 writings on the subject till June, 1872. His lists are classified and very accurate.) (TR.)

Pope Pius IX. first made known his thoughts of holding an Ecumenical Council on the 6th of December, 1864, while presiding at the Vatican Palace over a session of the Congregation of Rites.[1] Two days later he published the Syllabus of Errors and the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*. Between this publication and the convocation of the Vatican Council, men of judgment and ability have professed to find a close and even necessary connection.[2] The Pope imposed silence on the cardinals as to what he had said, and directed them to hand in

[1] The True Story of the Vatican Council, by Cardinal *Manning*, London, 1877, p. 3. (TR.)

[2] In the *Voices* of Maria-Laach, preface to the *Ecumenical Council*, new series, No. 7, it is said: "The intrinsic and essential connection between the Encyclica of December 8, 1864, and the Ecumenical Council, convoked by Pius IX., and to be opened this year, is self-evident. The Council will complete the structure, the foundations of which were laid in the Encyclica."

Hosted by Google

their opinions on the subject in writing. In expressing their opinions, some of the cardinals spoke particularly of the dominant errors of the present time; of the tendency to exclude God from society and to ignore Him in Science; of the efforts to destroy the idea of a visible Church and to deny both the possibility and the fact of a divine revelation; and of the consequences flowing directly from the withdrawal of civil society and science from the authority of the Church. Others spoke of the importance of holding an Ecumenical Council, setting forth that the condition of the world at the present time was such as to render the holding of a Council as necessary as in the age of Luther; that evils were extraordinary, and needed an extraordinary remedy. Others again pointed out the obstacles in the way of holding an Ecumenical Council, indicated the means of setting them aside, and maintained that if a choice had to be made between the holding of a Council and the dangers that were likely to surround such an event, the positive good that would be accomplished by the former would far outweigh the evils that might be incident to the latter. Finally, others spoke of the subjects to be treated by the Council, suggesting the condemnation of modern errors, the fuller exposition of Catholic teaching, the observance of discipline, and its adaptation to the needs of the present time; but, strange to say, only two spoke of Papal Infallibility, and one of these in a general way, in speaking of Gallicanism.[1]

Again, in the early part of March, 1865, Pius IX. appointed a Commission to consult together on the advisability and opportuneness of holding an Ecumenical Council. After conferring together, the Consultors recommended that eminent churchmen be called to Rome from every country of the world, to lay open the needs of the Church in their respective localities, and to suggest proper remedies; that, to avoid waste of time, the subjects likely to be taken up by the Council should be designated beforehand, prepared and arranged; and that an extraordinary Congregation should be formed, to have full direction of all matters belonging to the Council. The resolutions of the Commission were submitted to and approved by the Pope, who thereupon created the *Commission* or *Congregation of Direction*, consisting of the five cardinals previously composing the Commission, together with a secretary and eight bishops. This Congregation was subsequently distributed into four sections, the first on doctrine, the second on politico-ecclesiastical or mixed questions, the third on missions and the Oriental churches, and the fourth on discipline, each having its headquarters at the office of some already existing Congregation, to which its business was most closely allied.[2]

On the 27th of March, 1865, the Pope directed the Secretary of the Congregation of Direction to send letters, under strict secrecy, to some European and Oriental bishops, eminent for learning, asking them to state what questions, in their opinion, ought to be treated by the Council. With wonderful unanimity they all designated substantially the same ones, stating that, although there was no specific heresy to be condemned, there was, nevertheless, a general perversion of fundamental truths and a universal confusion as to first principles, and that therefore the Council ought to speak out explicitly concerning such

[1] The True Story of the Vatican Council, pp. 4–12. (Tr.)

[2] *Ibid.*, l. c., pp. 12, 22, and 71. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

truths and principles as underlie the whole of Christianity. They particularly insisted upon an explicit declaration being made concerning the nature and personality of God; upon the possibility and fact of a divine revelation; and upon the relations of the Church to civil governments and of Christian civilization to modern progress.[1]

On the 17th of November, 1865, the nuncios at Paris, Vienna, Madrid, Munich, and Brussels were informed by letter of the intention of Pius IX. to hold an Ecumenical Council, and directed to give their opinion as to its opportuneness, and to forward the names of two theologians or canonists of special name in the countries to which they were respectively accredited. No day had as yet been fixed upon for the opening of the Council, although the 29th of June, 1867, had at one time been thought of; but the war-cloud that was gathering on the horizon of Europe warned the Pope to put off the event to some future day. Here the affair of holding an Ecumenical Council rested for the present. On the 8th of December, 1866, a circular letter was written to all the bishops of the Catholic Church, inviting them to come to Rome to celebrate the Centenary in the following year; and on the 6th of June, 1867, Cardinal *Caterini*, Prefect of the Congregation of the Council,[2] sent a circular to all the bishops, containing a schedule of seventeen important points on morals and discipline, in each of which they were requested to hand in their opinions within four months. These related chiefly to the sacredness of Christian marriage; to the tone required in the Christian pulpit, and the necessity of taking revealed truth as the basis of all sermons and instructions; to the importance of having schools under Christian influences; to the necessity of a higher standard of studies in ecclesiastical seminaries; to the means of securing a more advanced culture in both sacred and profane knowledge among the clergy; to the policy of encouraging the increase of Religious Congregations, whose members are bound only by simple vows; to the best means of providing for worthy appointments to bishoprics and parishes; and to the lawful exercise of episcopal authority over the inferior clergy. Reference was also made to the duty of excluding non-Catholics from the office of sponsors at baptism, and from menial services in Catholic families, and to the removal of abuses in connection with Catholic cemeteries.[3] By many of the bishops this document was communicated to their priests, and in this way the Catholic Church throughout the world was in a measure prepared for the convocation of an Ecumenical Council. Pius IX. first *publicly* announced his intention of convoking an Ecumenical Council in a Consistory, held, on account of the great number present, in the tribune above the atrium of St. Peter's, on the 26th of June, 1867, and attended by the five hundred bishops who had come to Rome to take part in the solemnities of the Centenary of SS. Peter and Paul. The bishops, in their reply, delivered in an audience of the 1st of July, said "that their souls were filled with the greatest joy when they learned from his own mouth that, notwithstanding the diffi-

[1] The True Story of the Vatican Council, pp. 22–36. (TR.)

[2] Established by Pius IV. to interpret the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. (TR.)

[3] The Circular of the Cardinal, *ibid.*, No. 3, pp. 7–10; and in Acta et Decreta Conc. Vat., fasc. I., p. 22.

Hosted by Google

culties of the times, he still determined to convoke an Ecumenical Council, in order, in the words of his illustrious predecessor, Paul III., that '*a supreme remedy might be applied to the supreme dangers that threaten Christianity.*'" [1] In publicly announcing his intention to convoke a Council, Pius IX. omitted to fix the day of opening. This he did in a Secret Consistory, held on the 22d of June, 1868, when, after having asked the cardinals if, in their opinion, it was expedient to promulgate, on the coming 29th of June, the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, to convene on the 8th of December, 1869, and having received a unanimously affirmative answer, he bade them pray from that time forth for the special aid of the Holy Ghost.[2]

Accordingly, on the Feast of the Princes of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, Pius IX. published the Bull of Indiction,[3] *Aeterni Patris*, announcing to the world the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, to convene in the Vatican on the 8th of December, 1869, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. At the close of the form of convocation the bull goes on: "Hence we will and command that all the Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops everywhere, so also the beloved sons, the Abbots, and all other persons whose right or privilege it is to take part in General Councils, come to this Ecumenical Council convoked by Us." The bull then states that those who are under obedience to be at the Council, and absent themselves without just cause, of which the Procurators of the Synod are to be the judges, are liable to penalties which it is both lawful and customary to inflict in such cases. Then follows this paragraph: "In this confidence we hope that God, in whose hands are the hearts of men, will, by His ineffable mercy and grace, bring it to pass that all sovereign princes and rulers of all peoples, above all, such as are Catholic . . . will, not only not hinder our venerable brethren from coming to the Council, but, as becomes Catholic princes, earnestly favor them and give them help." The bull, as a whole, is very like that published by Paul III. in 1542, convoking the Council of Trent, except that the work to be accomplished was stated with rather more terseness and precision in the latter than in the former. The task of the Vatican Council is thus drawn out by Pius IX.: "In this Ecumenical Council must be examined with the greatest accuracy and decreed, all things which, especially in these rough times, relate to the greater glory of God, the integrity of the faith, the splendor of divine worship, the eternal salvation of man, the discipline of the secular and regular clergy, their wholesome and solid culture, the observance of ecclesiastical laws, the amendment of manners, the instruction of youth, and the common peace and concord of all. And, with God's help, a most earnest endeavor must be made to avert all evils from the Church and from Civil Society, and to bring back those who are unhappily straying away to the straight path of truth, justice, and salvation; to the end that, when vice and error are removed, our august religion and its saving doctrines may be revived over the whole earth, and spread from day to day until their empire is complete, that thus piety, honesty, probity, justice,

[1] Card. *Manning*, Petri Privilegium, Pt. I., p. 124. (TR.)

[2] Card. *Manning*, The True Story, etc., p. 62. (TR.)

[3] In the Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 48 sq.; and in the Voices of Maria-Laach, new series, No. I., pp. 7–15.

Hosted by Google

charity, and all Christian virtues that are of greatest utility to human society may acquire fresh strength and new beauty. For no one can deny that the power of the Catholic Church and of her doctrine is exerted, not alone for the salvation of men, but also for the temporal well-being of peoples, their true prosperity, order, and tranquillity, and for the progress and solidity of human sciences, as the annals of both sacred and profane history clearly and plainly show by luminous facts."

On the 8th of September, 1868, a letter of invitation, beginning *Arcanae divinae providentiae*, was sent to *all the bishops of the Churches of the Oriental Rite who are not in communion with the Apostolic See.* In this letter Pius IX. stated that "being the successor of the Blessed Prince of the Apostles, who, 'in virtue of the prerogative conferred upon him by God, is the firm and most solid rock upon which the Savior built His Church,' it was his urgent duty to extend his care to every part of the world inhabited by Christians, and his earnest wish and desire to excite in all a yearning to return to the embraces of fatherly charity." He added: "Our thoughts have been constantly upon those Churches which, when united of old with the Apostolic See, enjoyed so high a reputation for holiness and heavenly doctrine, and brought forth fruits so abundantly for the glory of God and the salvation of souls; but which now, through the wicked arts and contrivances of him, who was the author of the first schism in Heaven, remains, to our great sorrow, cut off and separate from the communion of the Holy Roman Church, spread over the whole earth." After referring to a fruitless letter, addressed to them in the beginning of his pontificate, and expressing his determination never to lose hope, the Pope continues: "Having convoked an Ecumenical Council, to be opened in Rome next year on the 8th of Dec., the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of God, we again call upon you, and do most earnestly entreat, admonish, and implore you to be good enough to come to this general synod, as your predecessors came to the Second Council of Lyons (1274) and to the Council of Florence (1439), that the bonds of ancient friendship being renewed and peace restored, the long night of darkness and sorrow may be dispelled, and the cheering light of longed-for union shine forth to all."[1] The Patriarch of the Orthodox Greek Church, to whom this letter was presented, did not even open it;[2] but, on the other hand, neither did the remonstrance drawn up by a schismatical priest of Ceos in Bithynia, against the "arrogance of the Pope," meet with any favor. The movement among the Armenians toward a union with Rome, occasioned by the invitation of the Pope, and headed by the Armenian Catholic Patriarch at Constantinople, was thwarted by intrigue and violence.[3]

On the 13th of September, 1868, the Pope published an invitation to *Protestants* and other non-Catholics, believing in Jesus Christ, but not of the fold of the Church. All such, he said, "he admonished, exhorted, and besought to seriously ask themselves if they were walking in the path pointed out by Christ the Lord, which leads to eternal life. And no one can deny," he goes on to say, "or doubt that Christ Jesus, in order to apply the fruits of His Redemp-

[1] Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 54, 55; *Voices*, l. c., pp. 15–18.

[2] Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 73. (Tr.)

[3] Cf. *Voices*, 1869, No. I., pp. 40 sq.; No. 3, pp. 31 sq.; *Friedberg*, p. 12.

Hosted by Google

tion to all generations of the human family, has built His only Church here on earth upon Peter; that is to say, the one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, to which He has granted all necessary power to preserve whole and inviolate the deposit of faith, and to extend this same faith to all peoples and races and nations, to the end that, all men being made members of His Mystical Body by Baptism, the new life of grace, without which no one can ever merit or secure eternal life, may be continued and made perfect; and that this same Church, which is His Mystical Body, may remain stable and unchanged to the end of time, and supply to all her children the sure means of salvation. Now, any one attentively considering and weighing the condition of the various and discordant religious societies separated from the Catholic Church . . . should be easily led to conclude that no single one of them, nor all of them together, can by any manner be that one and Catholic Church which Christ the Lord built and constituted; neither can they by any means be said to be a branch or a part of that Church, since, as is plain, they are separated from Catholic unity. For, because these societies are destitute of that living authority, established by God for the special purpose of instructing men in the doctrines of faith and the precepts of morals, and directing and ruling them in all that pertains to eternal life, they are ceaselessly changing their teachings. . . . And every one knows that from these doctrinal dissensions and conflicts of opinion arise social schisms, and from these again countless religious bodies and sects daily spring up, to the great detriment of both Church and State. . . . Hence let all, who have not the unity and truth of the Catholic Church, embrace the occasion of this Council, . . . which affords a fresh proof of the Church's close unity, and of the undying vitality of her strength, to satisfy the cravings of their own hearts by rising from their present condition, in which they can have no security of their salvation. Let them pray most fervently to the God of mercies, that He will be pleased to pull down the walls of separation, to dispel the darkness of error, and to lead them back to the bosom of Holy Mother Church, in which their forefathers were fed upon the saving Bread of Life, and in which alone the teaching of Jesus Christ is preserved intact and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed." By the great bulk of the Protestants this invitation, breathing such earnestness and love, was received with derision and contempt. Some of the most zealous and bigoted, and notably superintendents and members of provincial consistories, claiming to be in possession of the pure evangelical doctrine, took offense at the tone of the Pope, peremptorily rejected his invitation, and avenged themselves by making a number of serious charges against both the Church and her Head. A few earnest and thoughtful men were disposed to recognize the rights of the Father of Christendom to send out such an invitation, and were correspondingly grateful. Among these were: In Germany, *Baumstark*, Counsellor *Reinold*, of Constance, and *Wolfgang Menzel*, of Stuttgart; *Guizot*, in France; and in England, *Dr Pusey*.[1]

To insure the divine blessing upon the Council, the Holy Father invoked the

[1] *Friedberg*, pp. 12–16; *Voices*, No. 4, pp. 92 sq.; *Baumstark*, Reflections of a Protestant on the Pope's Invitation to a Reunion with the Catholic Church. Cf. Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 63–65.

Hosted by Google

aid of *prayer*. Having, he said, himself called unceasingly upon the Father of light, the Dispenser of mercies, and the Giver of every good, to grant that the gift of wisdom might be given to him and abide with him and work through him, so also did he desire to arouse the piety and stimulate the devotion of the faithful of Christ, *by proclaiming an indulgence in the manner of a jubilee*, in the hope that all would unite their prayers with his in imploring God to illuminate the Council with the light of Heaven, and thus guide it to enact what would most promote the general well-being of all Christian peoples, advance the interests of the Catholic Church, and secure her peace and prosperity.[1]

During the winter of 1868 and 1869 many theologians were called to Rome from the various parts of Italy, from France and Belgium, Germany and England, and Spain and North America, to assist in the work of *immediate preparation* for the Council. These were distributed into six Commissions,[2] viz., the Commission on Rites and Ceremonies, the Commission on Mixed or Politico-ecclesiastical Questions, the Commission on Foreign Missions and the East, the Commission on Religious Orders, the Commission on Dogma, and the Commission on Discipline, each of which, presided over by a cardinal, was engaged in preparing subjects belonging to its province for the Council. The strict obligation of secrecy was laid upon all the Consultors. Two questions of vital importance now came before the Commission of Direction: first, were bishops, having no ordinary jurisdiction, such as vicars apostolic, entitled to sit in the Council and to have a decisive vote; and, second, to whom belonged the right of prescribing the order or method by which the proceedings of the Council should be regulated.

To the first it was answered that in the bulls by which preceding Councils were convoked no distinction was made, the form of the summons running "archbishops and bishops," and that therefore none should now be made. The decision of the second question was not so easy, some of the bishops contending that this right belonged to the Fathers of the Council; but, after a careful examination of the precedents of former Councils, it was decided, on the 29th of June, 1869, "that the right of regulating the Council belonged to the authority which convened it, and that it was the highest prudence to retain that right in the hands of him who is the Head, not only of the Council, but of the Church."[3] Accordingly, on the 27th of November, 1869, this decision may be said to have been made part of the law of the Church by the publication of the bull *Multiplices inter*, prescribing the rules governing the proceedings and the members of the Council, or, in a wide sense, indicating the *Order of Business*.[4] One of

[1] *Voices*, 1869, No. IV., pp. 5–12.

[2] For the names of those composing the various Commissions, see *Voices*, 1869, No. II., pp. 69 sq.

[3] Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp 72–74. (Tr.)

[4] Acta et Decreta, fasc. II., pp. 66–74, Ecum. Council; *Voices*, No. VI., pp. 10–24. Cf. *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, pp. 33–42. The bull *Multiplices inter*, providing for the regulation of the affairs of the Council, is divided into ten sections, as follows: I. De modo vivendi in Concilio; II. De jure et modo proponendi; III. De secreto servando in Concilio; IV. De ordine sedendi et de non inferendo alicui praejudicio, i. e., establishing the order of rank and pre-

Hosted by Google

the most important paragraphs of this bull is the second, "*On the right and method of introducing matters to be treated.*" All questions that might come before the Council could not of course be foreseen by the Commission of Direction, and it was necessary, in order to save time and avoid confusion, to have some regular channel through which new subjects might be brought before the Council. A *Commission on Postulates*, consisting of six-and-twenty cardinals and bishops, eminent for experience and prudence, was therefore appointed by the Pope, and every bishop desiring to propose a new subject in Council was required to lay it before this Commission in the form of a written petition to the Pontiff. The efficiency of such a plan no one will deny; neither can there be any just suspicion of unfairness, for it seems morally impossible that six-and-twenty prudent bishops would be adverse to bringing forward any matter really worth being proposed to the Council.[1]

Another point of vital importance was the mode of discussion and voting provided for in the two paragraphs of the bull *Multiplices inter*, entitled, respectively, *On the General Congregations of the Fathers* and *On Public Sessions*. It was as follows: The preparatory labors of the Commission of Direction and its theologians and canonists were sifted and arranged into *schemata* or draft-decrees, which were wholly the work of the bishops who prepared them, and had no supreme sanction whatever. Printed copies of the *schemata* were distributed to the Fathers of the Council as a basis of discussion, which was conducted as follows: At the outset of the Council the Fathers were to elect by secret vote four special Congregations or Deputations, viz.: 1. On Faith; 2. On Discipline; 3. On Regular Orders; and, 4. On the Affairs of the Eastern Church, consisting each of twenty-four members, and continuing to exercise their functions during the time the Council was in session.[2] Each Father was to be in possession of the *schemata* some days, ten at least, before discussion upon them was opened. These *schemata* were first discussed in the *General Congregations* of the whole Council, where, if any particular *schema* was accepted as a whole, it was next taken up paragraph by paragraph and clause by clause. If, on the contrary, it provoked discussion, the arguments on both sides, as taken down in short-hand, were referred to the one of the four Commissions to which the subject in question belonged. The whole *schema* was now exam-

---

cedence; V. De judicibus excusationum et querelarum, i. e., appointing a Commission on Excuses to decide upon the excuses sent by bishops not present and upon those sent in by bishops desiring to leave, and a second Commission on Disputes, to settle any questions that may arise relative to rank and precedence; VI. De officialibus Concilii, i. e., providing for the appointment and duties of the officers belonging to the Council; VII. De congregationibus generalibus Patrum; VIII. De sessionibus publicis, an account of which is given in the text; IX. De non discedendo a Concilio; X. Indultum apostolicum de non-residentia pro iis qui Concilio intersunt, i. e., exempting by apostolic indult those who were engaged at the Council from the usual penalties attaching to absence from their benefices.

[1] Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp. 75, 78, and 89. (Tr.)

[2] See the bull *Multiplices inter*, sec. VII. De Congregationibus generalibus Patrum. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

ined in the light of the arguments brought out in the discussion, amended or recast, printed, and again brought before the General Congregation by one of the members of the Commission, selected for the purpose. If the *schema* needed further corrections or amendments, the same process was repeated, and so on until a satisfactory *schema* was obtained. The final verdict on a *schema* was, of course, determined by vote, which was taken in the following manner: Those voting *aye* said *placet;* those voting *no, non-placet;* and those voting *aye*, with a condition or qualification, said *placet juxta modum.* The last kind of vote was permitted only in General Congregations, not in Public Sessions, and those who so voted were required to send in, in writing, their correction or amendment, which was printed, submitted to the Commission, and voted upon at the next General Congregation.[1]

On the 20th of February, 1870, a *decree* was published, containing some further rules, which, while providing for full freedom of discussion, were designed to prevent irrelevant and useless controversy, to make the debates more orderly and direct, and to save time and expedite business. These just limitations gave offense to some, who regarded them as strictures on their freedom of speech and action; but it is difficult, on reading them over, to view them as other than wise regulations, admirably adapted for the guidance and government of such a body as the Vatican Council. The rules governing the debates in the American Congress or the British Parliament do not allow a wider liberty, and are not nearly so simple and precise.

Some of the bishops also thought that the provisions of the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis moderationi*, signed by the Pope October 12, 1869, and published as a part of the *law* of the Church on the 14th of December, abrogating a number of *censures*,[2] not applicable to the changed circumstances of these times, should have been incorporated in one of the *schemata*, and brought before the Council; and, because this was not done, a few began to express their fears that their freedom would be restrained. It is not easy to understand why the exercise of a papal prerogative, which at any other time would have excited no comment, should then be taken as indicating a purpose to control the action of an Ecumenical Council.

Having now given the history of the origin of the Vatican Council and of the events that preceded its opening, it only remains to mention the subjects to be laid before it, and to speak more or less in detail of *papal infallibility*, which, though it was never mentioned by the Pope in connection with the proceedings of the Council, nor suggested by any of the Consultors, except by one or two incidentally, nor explicitly contained in any of the *schemata*, seemed, nevertheless, the one question that was uppermost in the minds of men.

Of the subjects to be brought before the Council, it will be sufficient to give the *schemata* prepared by the theologians and canonists of the Commission of Direction. They were as follows: 1. Schema on Catholic Doctrine against the manifold errors flowing from Rationalism; 2. Schema on the Church of Christ; 3. Schema on the Office of Bishops; 4. Schema on the Vacancy of Sees;

[1] Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp. 78–80. (TR.)

[2] Acta et Decreta, fasc. I., pp. 77–85; Ecum. Counc., *Voices*, No. VII., pp. 10–17.

Hosted by Google

5. Schema on the Life and Manners of the Clergy; 6. Schema on the Little Catechism.[1]

For some years previously to the convocation of the Vatican Council, parties hostile to the prerogatives of the Holy See had existed in both France and Germany. In the former country the immediate occasion of their hostility was the condemnation of certain errors in politics by Gregory XVI.; in the latter the condemnation of certain errors in science by Pius IX. These parties had been steadily growing in number and gaining in strength up to the moment of the celebration of the Centenary in 1867. Five hundred bishops on that occasion emphatically affirmed the Pope's prerogatives in the most ample way, stating that "Peter spoke by the mouth of Pius;" that whatever Pius "spoke, confirmed, and pronounced for the safe custody of the deposit," they likewise "spoke, confirmed, and pronounced;" and that, "with one voice and one mind," they rejected whatever he had "judged fit to reprove and reject."[2] It is not surprising, therefore, that this declaration, taken in connection with the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, should have alarmed and stimulated to renewed activity those who, believing that the prerogatives of the Holy See were already too extensive, were engaged in a strenuous effort to force them within narrower limits by withdrawing political and scientific questions from the jurisdiction of the Church. With the instinct of error, they discovered the quarter from which to apprehend danger, and at once began a malignant war on papal infallibility, although, as has been seen, the subject had not been even mentioned by either the Pope or any one officially connected with the Council. Everything was done that could be done to prevent papal infallibility from being promulgated as a dogma. Its opponents held conferences, organized, matured an elaborate system of attack, divided their forces, apportioned the labor according to the gifts and qualifications of individuals, those of one country kept up an active correspondence with their allies in every other, and in 1868 a work entitled *Janus* appeared in Germany, which, as Cardinal Manning says, was "an elaborate attempt of many hands to destroy by profuse misrepresentation of history the authority of the Pope, and to create animosity against the future Council.[3]

The *Schema* on the Church of Christ contained only two chapters on the Head of the Church, the first on the Primacy and the second on the Temporal Power. No more had been prepared in the beginning of the year 1869. The Commission, taking up the subject again at this date, found it impossible to treat the Primacy without at the same time treating its endowments, and, as a consequence, the question of infallibility. Hence, on the 11th of February, when the subject was reached, two questions came up for discussion: 1. *Can* the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff be defined as an article of *faith?* 2. *Ought* it to be so defined? To the first question the Consultors answered unanimously in the affirmative; to the second, all but one answered indirectly that it ought not be brought before the Council except at the request of the bishops.[4]

[1] Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 82. (TR.)
[2] *Ibid.*, l. c., p. 51. (TR.)
[3] *Ibid.*, l. c., pp. 67 sq. (TR.)
[4] *Ibid.*, l. c., p. 83. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

While the Consultors were still at work on the additional chapters of the *Schema* on the Church of Christ, a correspondence from France, dated February 6, 1869, appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, in which the writer predicted that the Council would be of short duration, and stated that it was the unanimous wish of all Catholics to have the teachings of the *Syllabus* formally enunciated and the infallibility of the Pope proclaimed by acclamation. In commenting on the article in the Civiltà, *The Catholic* of Mentz[1] said that the sentiments there expressed had been promptly disavowed by the highest authorities in Rome; that even the General of the Jesuits declined to give them his approval; and that words penned by some over-zealous and imprudent writers, and sanctioned by a few others, should not be taken as an authoritative utterance on the line of action to be pursued by the Council. Still the article was generally regarded as significant, and the discussion of the subject was taken up everywhere. Simultaneously in France, Germany, and Belgium, in England and the United States, the columns of newspapers and periodicals were crowded with editorials on the subject, and pamphlets and treatises came from the press in hurried succession, nearly all the opposition writers drawing their weapons of attack from the armory supplied by *Janus* in the preceding year. The excitement was steadily on the increase, and nothing was left undone to prevent a return of men's minds to sobriety and calmness. An article, entitled the *Council and the Civiltà*, which appeared in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette* on the 10th of March, 1869,[2] so alarmed the fears of even well-meaning educated laymen, that a number of them, then attending the Parliament in Berlin, thought it their duty to send an address to the bishops assembled at Fulda, expressing their misgivings. The bishops, in consequence, published a *Pastoral Letter*,[3] in which they said that "an Ecumenical Council could never, by any possibility, proclaim as a dogma a doctrine not contained in Holy Writ and Apostolic Traditions, and that the Church, in giving decisions on matters of faith, does not promulgate new doctrines at all, but sets old truths in a clearer light, thus guarding them against fresh errors." The bishops of Austria, Hungary, France, and other countries issued pastoral letters of a like character, assuring their flocks that the aims and purposes of the Holy See had been grossly misrepresented. Bishop Dupanloup went the length of saying that extravagant opinions were wafted from France across the Alps; that wisdom and moderation came from Rome. Infallibility became a subject of disquieting anxiety, even in diplomatic circles. A document, bearing date of April 9, 1869, signed by Prince Hohenlohe, the Bavarian minister, but written by an abler hand, was sent to all the governments of Europe, inviting their co-operation in a combined attempt to oppose the Council. "The only dogmatic thesis," he said, "which Rome would wish to have decided by the Council . . . is the infallibility of the Pope."[4] Such were some of the attempts made to misrepresent, intimi-

[1] *La Civiltà Cattolica*, anno XXmo, p. 352. (Tr.) "*The Catholic*," Year 1869, Vol. I., p. 727.

[2] Number 69. See also *Acton*, l. c., pp. 18 sq., "Attitude of Statesmen before the Opening of the Council."

[3] It was signed by twenty-one bishops and proxies. The text is given in the *Voices*, 1869, Nos. V.–X., followed by pastoral letters from other countries.

[4] Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 68. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

date, and overawe the Council. Every sort of argument was made use of to convey to the world a wrong notion of its aims and purposes. The whole world seemed arrayed and banded against it, and, as the day of its opening drew near, the violence and malignity of the opposition increased. Still the preparations for the Council went steadily forward, heedless of this multitudinous clamor of angry tongues.

The Bull of Indiction was promulgated June 29, 1868, and by the day set for the opening, December 8, 1869, the bishops and apostolic vicars from the most remote countries had arrived in Rome. They were there from California and Mexico; from Brazil, Peru, Chili, and New Granada; from the Philippine Islands and Australia; and from India, Siam, Tunkin, China, and Japan.

Pius IX. considerately provided for the suitable support of the more indigent of the prelates. By the middle of December the number of the Fathers had risen to above seven hundred, but was considerably reduced during the progress of the Council by death and other causes. At the *Third Public Session*, held April 24, 1870, there were present only six hundred and sixty-seven, of whom 43 were cardinals, 9 patriarchs, 8 primates, 107 archbishops, 456 bishops, 1 administrator of a diocese, 6 privileged abbots, 20 abbots-generals, and 43 superiors-generals of Religious Orders and Congregations.[1] Over the *Four Public Sessions* the Pope presided in person, while the *General Congregations* were presided over by five Cardinal Presidents, appointed by him. Cardinal *von Reisach* was First President, and with him were associated Cardinals *de Luca*, *Bizarri*, *Bilio*, and *Capalti*. Cardinal *von Reisach* died in Savoy, after a short illness, on Christmas day, 1869, and Cardinal *de Angelis* was named First President in his room. Bishop *Fessler*, of St. Pölten, had been appointed Secretary of the Council before its opening.

§ 413b. *The Vatican Council and its Immediate Consequences.*

At a *Preliminary Congregation* (*Congregatio prosynodalis*), held in the Sistine Chapel, December 2, 1869, Pius IX., who presided, said he could not put in words the great joy he felt at seeing gathered about him so many bishops from all parts of the Catholic world, and that his joy was so much the greater in that he felt they were bound to him by the same bond of love that bound the Disciples to their Master. He said they were come together to provide remedies

[1] For further classification and statements by countries, see *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, p. 15–20. Of the 107 archbishops, e. g., there were 23 Greeks and Orientals (8 Armenians, 5 Chaldeans, 4 Maronites, 3 Syrians, 1 Greek 1 Greek Melchite, and 1 Roumanian); 23 Italians and 46 from other countries (10 from France, 10 from North America, 3 from Austria, 3 from Germany, 2 from Ireland, 2 from Belgium and Holland, and 1 from England); finally, 15 archbishops *in partibus infidelium*. Of the 456 bishops, 293 are to be booked for Europe, viz., 122 for Italy (of whom but few cobishops), 61 for France, 31 for Spain, 18 for the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, 16 for Ireland, 15 for Germany, 11 for England and Scotland, 9 for Turkey and Greece, 7 for Switzerland, with the bishops' substitutes of Geneva, Choire, and of the Abbey of Saint Maurice (in the Valais), 5 for Belgium and Holland, and 2 for Portugal.

Hosted by Google

for the great evils that threatened Christian and Civil Society in these times, and prayed that the blessing of God might fall upon them and upon their work.[1] After the *Allocution*, the names of the Cardinal Presidents and other officials were made known, and the *Constitution* for the regulation of the Council distributed to the bishops.[2]

On the 8th of December the Council was solemnly opened by a PUBLIC SESSION in the Council Hall in the transept, on the right-hand side of the Basilica of St. Peter. After the *Veni Creator* had been sung and *High Mass* said, the Book of Gospels was placed upon the Altar, where it remained open throughout the Session. A sermon was then preached, followed by the Synodal prayers, which were intoned by the Holy Father, and the Litany of the Saints. After the Gospel, the Pope made an *Allocution*,[3] in which he said: "Our heart rejoices and is glad with an exceeding great joy to see you, Venerable Brethren, gathered here in the citadel of the Catholic Religion, and on this holy and most auspicious Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in greater number than ever before. You are here in the name of Jesus Christ, to bear witness with us to the Word of God; to declare with us the truth to all men, which is the way that leads to God; and to condemn with us, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the doctrines of false science. You are aware, Venerable Brethren, of the violence of the assaults made by the old enemy of the human race against the House of God, which should be adorned with holiness. But, as St. John Chrysostom has said, 'nothing is more powerful than the Church; she is stronger than Heaven itself. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.' Be ye therefore strengthened in the Lord; and, sanctified in truth and clad with the armor of light, teach the way, the truth, and the life. God is present in His holy place; He is with us in our deliberations and our efforts; He has chosen us to be His servants and fellow-workers in this great work of His salvation. Therefore, knowing well our own weakness, and filled with mistrust of ourselves, we lift up our eyes and our prayers to Thee, O Holy Ghost, to Thee, the source of true light and wisdom."[4]

After the *Veni Creator* had been again sung, the Bishop of Fabriano read from the *Ambo* the decree of the opening of the Council, of which the following is the substance: "Is it the pleasure of the Fathers that the Ecumenical Council should be opened and should be declared open for the glory of the Most Holy Trinity, the custody and declaration of the faith and of the Catholic religion; for the condemnation of errors, which are widely spreading, and for the moral correction of clergy and people?" When the Fathers had unanimously answered *Placet*, the Pope declared the Council opened, and fixed the *Second Public Session* for the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6, 1870. Preparatory to it four *General Congregations* were held on the 10th, 14th, 20th, and

[1] See the Allocution of December 2d. (TR.)

[2] Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 86. (TR.)

[3] Both documents, the Pope's Allocution and the Sermon of the day, in the Acta et Decreta concilii Vaticani, fasc. II., pp. 144–153. Ecumenical Council, *Voices* from Maria-Laach, 1869, 1870, No. VI., pp. 24–42.

[4] See Allocution of December 8th. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

28th days of December. In the first of these the names of those composing the Commission on Postulates were made known, after which the five Judges of Excuses (*Judices excusationum*) were elected by the universal vote of the Council, and the *Schema* on *Catholic Doctrine* against the manifold errors flowing from Rationalism distributed to the Fathers. Five *Judices Querelarum*, for the determination of questions of rank and precedence, were also chosen, and the Constitution of December 4th, in which the Pope made provisions against the event of his death during the continuance of the Council, communicated to the Fathers.[1] In the second General Congregation, the members of the *Commission on Faith*, twenty-four in number,[2] were voted for, after which the Papal Constitution, *Apostolicae Sedis moderationi*, already mentioned, was laid before the Fathers. In the third General Congregation, the result of the vote for members of the Commission on Faith was made known, and an equal number elected for the *Commission on Discipline*. In the fourth General Congregation the same number were chosen to serve on the *Commission on Religious Orders*, after which the discussion was opened on the first Schema on Catholic Doctrine, and continued in the General Congregations held on the 30th of December, 1869, and the 3d and 4th of January, 1870, but without reaching any definite result. Hence, in the SECOND PUBLIC SESSION, the Fathers could do no more than make the *Profession of Faith*, according to the formulary of the Council of Trent. The members of all Councils, from that of Constantinople, in 381, where the Creed of the Council of Nicaea was repeated, down to the Council of the Vatican, have uniformly been required to make such profession. First the Pope rose, and facing the Fathers, the Book of Gospels being open on the Altar and the Tomb of St. Peter uncovered, read from his throne, in a loud, clear voice, the profession of the faith of Trent. The Bishop of Fabriano then read the same from the *Ambo*. The cardinals, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, and other Fathers of the Council, next signified their adhesion to this as their common faith by advancing and reverently kissing the Book of Gospels, open at the throne of the Pope. This seemed the fulfillment of the

[1] Acta et decreta, pp. 95–98; Ecumenical Council, *Voices*, No. VII., pp. 5–9.

[2] These were: The Roman, *Cardoni*, Archbishop of Edessa, in part, and the Archbishop of Modena, the Bishop of Treviso, and the Bishop of Calvi, from Italy; the Bishops Senestrey, of Ratisbon, and Martin, of Paderborn, from Germany; the Archbishop of Cambray and the Bishop of Poitiers, from France; the Archbishop of Saragossa and the Bishop of Jaen, in Spain; Archbishop Manning, of Westminster, from England; the Archbishop of Cashel, from Ireland; the Archbishop of Utrecht, Archbishop Deschamps, of Malines, Archbishop Ledochowsky, of Posen-Gnesen, and Primate of Poland; the Bishop of Sion or Sitten, in Switzerland; the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia, from Asia Minor, and the Archbishop of Bostra and Administrator of East India, from Eastern Asia; Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, and Archbishop Alemany, of San Francisco, from North America; the Archbishop of Santiago, in Chili, and the Bishop of Rio Grande de San Pedro, in Brazil, from South America. Cardinal *Bilio* was made President of this Committee. For the members of the *other committees*, see *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, pp. 56–61.

Hosted by Google

prayers of Our Lord, "that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; *that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.*" [1]

The first discussion on the *Schema* on Catholic Doctrine was closed at the *General Congregation* held January 10. Thirty-five Fathers had spoken, and the *Schema*, with their speeches and proposed amendments, was sent back to the Commission on Faith to be entirely recast. In the meantime the Fathers took up in the General Congregations the disciplinary *Schemata on the Vacancy of Sees, on the Life and Manners of the Clergy,* and *on the Little Catechism.* The first was discussed in seven General Congregations between the 14th and 25th of January, in which thirty-seven spoke; the second also in seven, between the 25th of January and the 8th of February, in which thirty-eight spoke; and the last in six, between the 10th and 22d of February, in which forty-one spoke [2] These *Schemata,* with the speeches and amendments, were then sent back to the Commission on Discipline. At the close of the last of these General Congregations, the Decree, already mentioned, containing some additional regulations, drawn up by the Commission on Postulates, intended to make the discussions more orderly, rigorous, and expeditious, was communicated to the Fathers. These rules provided that bishops desiring to make any changes or corrections in the *Schema* previously distributed to them should do so *in writing,* first on the *Schema* as a whole, and secondly on the chapters and paragraphs in detail; that after these proposed amendments had been printed and put into the hands of each of the Fathers, the Cardinal Presidents should fix a day for the opening of the discussion; that those wishing to speak should hand in their names to the Cardinal Presidents, and also state whether they were going to speak on the *Schema* as a whole or on one of its chapters, and if the latter, which one; that if any of the speakers spoke wide of the question, the Presidents might remind him of the fact; and, finally, that if it was clear the discussion was being uselessly prolonged, the Cardinal Presidents, at the written request of any ten of the Fathers, might, by a vote of the Congregation, decide whether it should go on or be closed.[3] As the *Schema on Catholic Doctrine* had not yet been completed, the second dogmatic *Schema on the Church of Christ* was distributed to the Fathers. As originally drawn up, it consisted of three Parts and fifteen Chapters.[4] By the new rules of debate, the Fathers had at least ten days to hand in their views and criticisms in writing. In the present case this period closed on March 4th. About one hundred and twenty papers were handed in on Chapters I. to X., including many memorials against the new Rules, signed jointly by a number of bishops, the lowest list

[1] St. John, XVII., 20, 21.

[2] Card. *Manning,* l. c., p. 96. It would seem, from the dates given above, that Card. Manning is incorrect in saying that these *Schemata* were discussed *after* the Third Public Session. (TR.)

[3] See the Decree of February 22d. (TR.)

[4] Part I., embracing chapters I. to X., treated of *The Church of Christ;* Part II., embracing chapters XI. and XII., treated of *The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff and his Temporal Power;* Part III., embracing chapters XIII. to XV., treated of *The Relation of the Church to the State.*

Hosted by Google

of signatures being four, and the highest twenty-nine. It has been already seen that that portion of the *Schema on the Church of Christ* treating of the Head of the Church contained only two Chapters, the one on his Primacy and the other on his Temporal Power. To complete the subject, many of the bishops desired to introduce a new Chapter on Papal Infallibility. The lawful way to do this was to send a petition to the Commission on Postulates, asking leave to introduce such a Chapter. A petition was accordingly drawn up, to which were subsequently added extracts from Provincial Councils favoring the doctrine, and circulated among the bishops, of whom four hundred and fifty signed it. A counter-petition was also drafted and signed by about one hundred bishops, asking that the question of Infallibility be not laid before the Council, on the ground that to define it would be both unwise and unseasonable, not that they disbelieved the doctrine itself.[1] The petition of the Infallibilists was accepted by the Commission on the 9th of February, and approved by Pius IX., and accordingly a third Chapter, entitled "*Romanum Pontificem in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse* was inserted between Chapters XI. and XII. of the original *Schema*.[2] This part of the Schema, as amended, was distributed to the Fathers on the 6th of March. They were requested to hand in their papers on the subject at the close of ten days, but this period proving too short, was extended eight days longer. By the 25th of March one hundred and forty-nine papers had been handed in, representing the views of above two hundred Fathers, some of the documents bearing the signatures of more than twenty bishops. The Commission on Faith made an *Analytical Synopsis* (*synopsis analytica*) of all these papers, which, when printed, filled two volumes, one of 144 pages, 4to, on the Primacy, and another of 242 pages, 4to, on the *Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*. From this it is clear that the Commission on Faith did not fail of its duty.

In the meantime the Schema on Catholic Doctrine had been recast by the Commission on Faith, and was distributed to the Council on the 14th of March. Instead of eighteen, it now consisted of only four Chapters, with an Introduction or *Prooemium*. In the Introduction the errors are enumerated that have sprung up in the world for the last three hundred years, thus logically connecting the Council of the Vatican with that of Trent. Of the four Chapters the first treats *Of God, the Creator of All Things;* the second, *Of Revelation;* third, *Of Faith;* and the fourth, *Of Faith and Reason*. To these were added *eighteen Canons*.

The second discussion on this Schema, as remodeled, began on the 18th of March. Nine Fathers spoke on the Schema *as a whole*, when, no one desiring to speak further, the general discussion was closed, and the special discussion on the Chapters, *one by one*, opened. Twenty-one[3] spoke on the *First Chapter;* twenty on the *Second;* twenty-two on the *Third;* and twelve on the *Fourth*. The *Prooemium*, after having been twice amended, was finally *unanimously* adopted in a General Congregation held March 29th. The First Chapter, after

[1] Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp. 98 and 113–115. (Tr.)

[2] For the reasons brought forward for and against *the defining* of infallibility, see Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp. 101–121. (Tr.)

[3] Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 93, says *sixteen*. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

revision and amendment, was passed April 1st; the Second, April 8th; and the Third and Fourth, April 12th. The *Schema*, as a whole, was then proposed for acceptance. No one voted *Non placet*, but eighty-three voted *Placet juxta modum*. Their amendments were sent to the Commission, printed in a quarto volume of fifty-one pages, and distributed. Finally the *Schema*, as amended, was adopted by an unanimous vote on the 19th of April.[1] In the THIRD PUBLIC SESSION, held on Dominica in Albis or Low Sunday, April 24, the *Dogmatic Constitution on Catholic Faith* was accepted by the *unanimous* vote of six hundred and sixty-nine Fathers.[2] On the following day the *Schema on the Little Catechism*, as revised by the Commission on Discipline, was distributed to the Council, and discussed in two General Congregations, held on the 29th and 30th of April. It was once more sent back to the Commission, with the amendments, but though it again came before the General Congregation on 4th and 13th of May, no definite result was reached. The *Schema on the Primacy and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff*, as it came back from the Commission on Faith, formed only one part of the original *Schema on the Church of Christ*, and was entitled *First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ*. It consisted of an Introduction and four Chapters: I. Of the Institution of the Apostolic Primacy in Blessed Peter; II. Of the Perpetuity of the Primacy of Blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs; III. On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff; IV. Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff. Printed copies of this *Schema*, embodying the amendments of the two hundred bishops, were distributed to the Fathers during the last days of April, and the general discussion opened on the 14th of May, and continued through fourteen sessions, closing on the 3d of June.

In that interval, sixty-four had spoken, the majority of them on Chapters III. and IV. A hundred others had sent in their names to speak, but as it appeared that all the arguments that could be brought forward had been exhausted; that the speakers were going on repeating themselves; that instead of confining their remarks to the *Schema* as a whole, they had already anticipated the discussion in detail, particularly as regards Chapters III. and IV.; that each of the seven hundred bishops might yet speak five times, that is, once on the Introduction and once on each of the Four Chapters, or, in other words, that there were still a possible three thousand and odd speeches to be listened to, it was necessary, as Cardinal Manning says, that in this, as "in all human affairs, the limits of common sense should be respected at last." As we have seen by the later regulations of the Council, any ten Fathers might petition the Presidents to put it to a vote to ascertain whether the discussion was to go on or be closed. The petition to close the general discussion was signed by about one hundred and fifty bishops, put to the Council, and carried by an immense majority. Then began the *special discussions* on the Introduction and the

[1] "In passing this one Schema, the interval between the 14th of March and the 19th of April was consumed; seventy-nine members of the Council spoke; three hundred and sixty-four amendments were made, examined, and voted upon; six reports were made by the Commission upon the text, which, after its first recasting, had been six times amended." Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 95. (TR.)

[2] Acta et Decreta, p. 170–179; Ecum. Counc., N. IX., p. 1–29, Lat. and Germ.

Hosted by Google

Chapters, one by one. In the first General Congregation, held June 6th, seven spoke on the Introduction; on the following day, three spoke on Chapter I. and five on Chapter II. The discussion on Chapter III. lasted from the 9th to the 14th of June, and thirty-two spoke. The Introduction and the first three Chapters, with the proposed amendments, were then sent back to the Commission on Faith. In the special discussion on *Chapter IV.*, which lasted through eleven Sessions, from the 15th of June to the 4th of July, fifty-seven spoke, among whom were six Cardinals and two Patriarchs. The Introduction and the first two Chapters were reported July 5, and adopted nearly unanimously. The discussion on Chapter IV. was opened by Cardinals *Rauscher* and *Matthieu* on the side of the opposition. It would appear that during this discussion, as in the Council of *Trent*,[1] some of the Fathers momentarily forgot themselves and lost their tempers. But as feeling ran high on both sides, and as bishops are after all human, this was in the nature of things. At the close of the discussion, Chapter IV., with ninety-six proposed amendments, was sent back to the Commission on Faith. On the 11th of July the Commission reported, having added three new paragraphs,[2] and substituted for the title *De Romani Pontificis Infallibilitate* the following: *De Romani Pontificis Infallibili Magisterio.* Most of the changes were accepted.

On the 13th of July, Chapters III. and IV. were adopted by a great majority. The whole *Schema on the Primacy and Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff* was again hastily printed and distributed to the Fathers for the final vote on the same day. There were present 601 Fathers, of whom 451 voted *Placet* or *aye;* 88 *Non placet* or *no;* and 62 *Placet juxta modum* or *aye*, with a qualification. The written amendments consequent upon this vote numbered one hundred and sixty-three, which were sent to the Commission, examined, and the report made on the 16th of July. Many of the amendments were adopted by a great majority; among others, two proposed by the Commission, and the following addition to the formula of the definition of Infallibility: "Ideoque Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese '*non autem ex consensu ecclesiae*' irreformabiles esse."[3]

The whole Schema was again reprinted, distributed, put once more to the vote and passed.[4] At the close of this General Congregation a protest was read by the Cardinal President against the numerous misrepresentations and falsehoods circulated concerning the Council in the newspapers of every tongue and

[1] See p. 351, *supra.*

[2] Card. *Manning*, l. c., p. 138. (Tr.)

[3] The formulary of Infallibility now ran as follows: Sacro approbante concilio docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum pontificem, cum ex cathedra loquitur, i. e., cum omnium christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus redemptor ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejusmodi Romani pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae irreformabiles esse.

[4] Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp. 138, 139. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

in anonymous pamphlets. Of the latter the Protest instanced two, "written in French and entitled *Ce qui se passe au Concile* and *La dernière heure du concile*, which, for the arts of calumny and the license of detraction, bear away the palm from all others." With this protest closed the eighty-fifth General Congregation. A last effort was now made to prevent the promulgation of the doctrine of Infallibility. On the evening of the 15th of July, *Simor*, Primate of Hungary; *Rivet*, Bishop of Dijon; and *von Kettler*, Bishop of Mentz, had an audience of the Pope, during which, speaking in the name of those whom they represented, they besought him not to promulgate the dogma of Infallibility, or at least to put it off until the *Schema on the Church of Christ* had been more fully discussed. Bishop *von Kettler*, in the urgency and earnestness of his appeal, cast himself on his knees three times before the Holy Father, but to no purpose. On the following day, Cardinal *Rauscher*, in taking leave of Pius IX., represented in strong language the possible evils that might follow the promulgation of the dogma, to whom the Pope replied: "The affair has gone too far now." On the 17th of July, a memorial, signed by fifty-five bishops, representing France, Austro-Hungary, Germany, and America, was sent to the Pope, to whom it was handed on the morning of the 18th. The Memorialists state that, acting on the dictates of their conscience, eighty-eight Fathers voted against the *First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ* at the General Congregation on the 13th of July, sixty-two voted *Placet juxta modum*, and seventy remained away altogether; that since that time their own convictions had been, if possible, strengthened, and they therefore now renewed the votes they then cast; that they purposed to stay away from the *Public Session* to be held on the 18th of July, because their filial love and reverence for the Holy Father would not permit them to say *no* openly and to his face in a matter that so nearly concerned him personally; and that they would therefore at once return and seek peace and quiet among their flocks, which on many accounts were sorely in need of their presence.[1] These bishops knew quite well that it was useless to say that they now repeated their votes of July 13th, for the reason that only the votes of those *actually present* were valid. On Tuesday, the 18th of May, the FOURTH PUBLIC SESSION was opened with the usual solemnities, Pius IX. presiding in person. After Mass had been celebrated and the *Veni Creator* sung, the Bishop of Fabriano read from the *Ambo* the text of the First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ, after which the under-secretary of the Council called upon each Father by name to vote. Of the 535 present, 533 voted *Placet*, and 2, one from Sicily and the other from the United States, *Non placet*; and even these subsequently expressed their full submission to the decision of the Council. In this way a moral and almost a numerical unanimity of those present was secured, thus carrying out the rule of the Council of Trent, to the effect that "*in plena synodo*" decisions were to be passed "*vel ab omnibus si fieri potest, vel a longe majori parte;*" while, on the other hand, the fact that two voted *nay* proved that the Fathers enjoyed the fullest freedom.

The Pope, then rising, said: "The Decrees and Canons, contained in the Constitution just read, have been received by all the Fathers, two only excepted;

[1] See *Friedrich*, pp. 263, 264; and *Friedberg*, pp. 622, 623.

Hosted by Google

and We, with the approbation of the Council, define both one and the other as read, and confirm them by our apostolic authority." [1]

He then went on to speak as follows: "The authority of the Roman Pontiff, great as it is, Venerable Brethren, does not oppress, but sustains: does not destroy, but builds up; and very frequently strengthens and defends the rights of our Brethren the Bishops. Hence, let those who now judge in agitation, bear in mind that the Lord is not in the storm. Let them remember that only a few years ago *they held the opposite opinion*, and abounded in the same belief with Us and in that of the greater part of this most august assembly, because then they judged in the spirit of 'gentle air.' . . . We pray God to illuminate their minds and hearts, that all may come to the bosom of their father, the unworthy Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, who loves them and desires to be one with them." [2]

The *Te Deum* was then sung, after which the *Fourth Public Session* of the Vatican Council was closed with Pontifical Benediction. While the voting was going forward, a violent thunderstorm was raging outside, which some interpreted as an articulate voice of divine anger, and others as a heavenly attestation to the truth of the dogma, like unto that which accompanied the promulgation of the Law on Sinai.

On the day of the holding of the Public Session war broke out between France and Prussia, and, as a consequence, Rome was menaced. This event, together with the excessive heat, which was intolerable to many of the bishops, reduced their number to about two hundred. The *General Congregations* were reopened on the 13th of August, and the *Schemata on Vacant Sees* and *on the Life and Manners of the Clergy* distributed. The work of the Council was shortly interrupted by political events, which followed each other in rapid succession. During the first days of August the French troops were withdrawn from Roman territory, and on the 20th of September the Piedmontese troops entered Rome. It being now next to impossible for the Fathers to go on with their work, the Holy Father, by the bull *Postquam Dei munere*, dated October 20, 1870, prorogued the Council until a more seasonable time.[3]

The day of the promulgation of the decree of the Infallibility of the Pope, July 18, coincided with the day on which France declared war against Prussia. The war was one of extraordinary magnitude, dreadful catastrophes, and alarming consequences, including the capture and dethronement of the Emperor *Napoleon III.*, the destruction of the French army, and the temporary paralysis of France. The design of seizing Rome had been long matured, and Victor Emmanuel, who had been up to this moment restrained by the power of France, now proceeded to carry the design into execution. *After a short,*

[1] Acta et Decreta, pp. 181–187; Ecumenical Council, *Voices*, No. 10, pp. 1–17, where the Constitution *Pater Aeternus* is given in Latin and German; The Vatican Council, pp. 221–230, in Latin and English.

[2] Acta et Decreta, p. 187; Ecum. Council, No. 10, p. 101.

[3] Acta et Decreta, pp. 190, 191; Ecum. Council, No. 11, pp. 9–12, Latin and German; *Friedberg*, pp. 623, 624.

Hosted by Google

but gallant struggle, the small pontifical army was defeated on the 20th of September, 1870, *and Rome taken forcible possession of by the troops of the Kingdom of Italy.* No European power came to the aid of the Pope; none offered him protection; and from that day to this he has been a prisoner within the walls and grounds of the Vatican. He is deprived of the freedom and independence necessary to the exercise of the functions of his high office and indispensable to one who is to govern the Church in every country. By the suppression of the monasteries he has been in a great measure deprived of the valuable services of a large body of learned and truly pious Regulars, whose assistance in the various Congregations is so necessary to him in the government of the Church. The *laws* passed by the Italian Parliament *guaranteeing his freedom and independence*, even allowing that there was ever any honest intention of carrying them out, would be utterly inadequate for the purpose in a country where the government suffers itself to be intimidated by the mob.

Some of the bishops, on returning home to their dioceses, found a few persons here and there dissatisfied with the work of the Council, and notably with the decree of Infallibility. It has been said that the definitions of the Council caused these to fall off from the unity of the Church; but, while the definitions may have been the occasion, they were not the cause. The lives of those who did go out from the Church had been for years a preparation for their final falling off, and the definitions of the Council only afforded them a plausible pretext for their action. As well might it be said that the Council of Nice was responsible for the eighty bishops that then fell away from the unity of the Church under a similar pretext, and for the large following that they brought with them; or the Council of Ephesus for the thirty bishops that still clung to the Nestorian heresy; or the Council of Chalcedon for the schism of the Monophysites; or the Council of Trent for driving whole nations over to the Lutheran heresy.[1]

Compared with the multitudes that dropped off from the unity of the mystical vine on the above occasions, those who left the Church after the close of the Vatican Council, or before it, were only a handful, and they separated for precisely the same reason, because they were not of her fold. The same explanation may be given of the policy pursued by governments. They rose simultaneously against the Church, were equally aggressive and malignant, and all assigned the very same pretexts for their action. But again the promulgation of the decree of Infallibility was only the occasion of these attacks. Their hostility was not greater after than it had been before the Council, only they had now a plausible argument to justify their conduct before the world.[2]

The bishops who signed the Memorial on the 17th of July closed by saying that they "*vowed unalterable fidelity and obedience to the Holy Father.*" Accordingly, after their return home, they at once submitted to the decision of the highest authority in the Church, and set an example to their respective flocks by promptly and cheerfully professing the articles of faith as set forth in the decrees and canons of the Vatican Council. In this they but did what

[1] See Card. *Manning*, l. c., pp. 199–202. (Tr.)

[2] For numerous diplomatic documents bearing on this question, see *Friedberg*, l. c., pp. 521–569.

Hosted by Google

had been done by a still larger number of bishops, after a long resistance to the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553, and by the liberal-minded Cardinal of Lorraine on a like occasion.[1] Even those who had questioned the seasonableness of the definition, including Bishop Dupanloup, and had made *that* the *sole* ground of their opposition, gave up their own opinions after the authoritative decision of the Council. In *Germany*, above all other countries, the opposition to the dogma was most marked and pronounced; but the excitement this opposition evoked did not reach its full height until Professor *von Döllinger*, Provost of the Chapter of Munich, at one time the most zealous and influential defender of the Catholic Church, published his "Reflections for the Bishops of the Council on the Question of Papal Infallibility," October, 1869; his "Analysis of the New Order of Business in the Council," March, 1870; and his "Declaration to the Archbishop of Munich," March 28, 1871. In this last publication he said that neither as a Christian, nor as a theologian, nor as an historian, nor as a citizen, could he accept the dogma of Papal Infallibility. These publications were widely circulated, exercised an immense influence, and brought out numerous expressions of approval and sympathy.[2] In the midst of this agitation and uncertainty the German bishops assembled at Fulda at the end of August, 1870, and published over all their names a common Pastoral Letter, in which they promulgated the Decrees of the Vatican, saying "these decrees have received a binding power on all the faithful by the fact of their final publication by the Supreme Head of the Church in solemn form at the Public Session."[3]

A special letter was written to the clergy of Eichstädt in May, 1871, and several bishops wrote pamphlets, fully explaining and defending the Vatican decrees.[4] The drift of these publications, whether of a public or private character,

[1] See Vol. I., pp. 625 sq.; and this Vol., p. 362.

[2] From the very beginning the excitement was kept up and intensified by the numerous *letters* published in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette* on the Roman Council; in *The Cologne Weekly;* in *The Rhenish Mercury*, specially founded for the occasion in 1869; and in *The German Mercury*, of Munich, since 1872. The letters to the *Augsburg Gazette*, in the composition of which it was not difficult to discover the hand of *Dr. Döllinger*, were republished under a new form at Leipsig in 1869, under the title of "The Pope and the Council," by *Janus;* and in Munich in 1870, under the title of "Roman Letters on the Council," by *Quirinus.* Bishop *von Kettler* wrote a refutation of them, entitled "The Utterances of the Roman Letters on the Council," in the *Augsburg Univ. Gazette*, Mentz, 1870; and *Hergenröther* another, entitled "Anti-Janus, a Historico-Apologetical Criticism of Janus;" and another, entitled "The Catholic Church and the Christian State, a Sequel to Anti-Janus," Freiburg, 1872.

[3] Ecumenical Council, No. 12, p. 8. Card. *Manning*, Petri Privilegium, London, 1871; Appendix VII., p. 227. (Tr.)

[4] *Bp. Fessler*, The True and the False Infallibility of the Popes, Vienna, 1871; transl. into French; Engl. tr., New York, 1875. *Bp. von Ketteler*, The Infallible Teaching-office of the Pope according to the Definition of the Vatican Council, Mentz, 1871. *Bp. Martin*, The True Sense of the Vatican Definition on the Infallible Teaching-office of the Pope, Paderborn, 1871.

Hosted by Google

was substantially as follows: 1. That Papal Infallibility does not mean that the Pope is *impeccable;* or that he can not err as a private teacher; or that he is *inspired* by the Holy Ghost, as were the prophets and apostles; but simply that in the exercise of his office of teacher of the Universal Church, i. e., when solemnly defining and promulgating a revealed truth that must be held by all (*doctrinam—tenendam definierit*), he is directed by a special *divine assistance* (*assistentia divina*) in such way that he can not fall into error. 2. That the subject-matter upon which the infallible teaching-office of the Roman Pontiff is to be exercised is limited to *faith* and *morals*, as contained in Holy Writ and Tradition; that this infallibility is identical with that claimed and exercised by the primitive Church in her office of teacher; that it resides in the Head of the Church and in the body united with the Head; and that it is exercised *through the Head*, the Bishop of Rome, whose right it has ever been to approve the decrees of Ecumenical Councils. 3. Finally, that therefore the claim to appeal to an Ecumenical Council, or to the verdict of the Church dispersed over the world from a papal definition, promulgated *ex cathedra*, can not be so much as entertained. Many also laid stress upon the necessity of remaining in the unity of the Church, and upon the deplorable consequences of an opposite course. In a pastoral letter, published June 16, 1871, *von Hefele*, Bishop of Rottenburg, used the following words: "While celebrating the Silver Jubilee of Our Holy Father, Pius the Ninth, we should renew and strengthen our determination never to depart from the Center of unity, and, despite the deplorable events taking place around us, to cling only to the Rock of Peter, firm in the conviction that no danger, whether real or imaginary, that is sought to be avoided by separation, is at all comparable to *the evil of separation itself.*"

It is with sorrow and reluctance, which no motive other than the gravity of our duty as an historian could overcome, that we now go on to relate some of the sad consequences that resulted from turning a deaf ear to warnings and admonitions like that of the Bishop of Rottenburg. Men like *Dr. Döllinger* and *Friedrich*, of Munich, *Reusch*, *Langen*, *Knoodt*, of Bonn; *Reinkens*, of Breslau; and *Michelis*, of Braunsberg, who had stood as priests at the Altar of the Church, and had been among the ablest and most energetic defenders of her doctrines, cut themselves off from her unity by their own act.[1] Since their separation, as they are frequently reminded, they have been maintaining doctrines the contrary of which they zealously professed. They who had been models of conduct, both as men of honor and Christian gentlemen, forgot themselves so far as to abuse the sacredness of friendship and to make a public use of what was intended to be strictly private and confidential.[2] Others again, on no authority other than public rumor, revile persons high in public esteem, not sparing the most exalted ecclesiastical dignitaries, and, while heaping contempt and ridicule upon those who joyfully accept the infallibility of the Pope, pertinaciously insist upon their own.[3] Having once been the accomplished champions of the freedom and independence of the Church, they now denounce her as

[1] For the transactions of the same, with their respective bishops, see *Friedberg*, l. c., pp. 57 sq., 688 sq.

[2] Conf. *Thiel*, My Discussion with the Janus-Christian, Lpsg. 1872.

[3] Foremost and extremest in this course is the *Rhenish Mercury*.

Hosted by Google

dangerous to the State, and call upon the Civil Power to resist her pretensions. Although not numerous, they are a compact body, laborious, active, and fiercely energetic; and although before the world so prominently and so long, the world is almost at a loss how to properly designate them. They have been called *Old Catholics* and *Protesting Catholics*, but it would seem that, in view of the fact that their one characteristic note and distinguishing feature is hostility to the Pope, they would be more appropriately called *Neo-Jansenists*. Their just claim to this designation appears to be borne out by facts. At the very beginning of their existence they made advances to the Jansenists, who were drawing out a feeble existence in Holland; they invited the Jansenistic bishops to their Conference at Munich; and in July, 1872, they called Loos, the Jansenistic Archbishop of Utrecht, to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation in the newly-formed Congregations in Bavaria. About four hundred children were confirmed on this occasion, and the archbishop, who had passed so many years of his official life in obscurity and inactivity, was not a little flattered to find himself called into public notice by those who, but a few years ago, almost ignored his existence and dismissed his claims with impatient contempt. But fresh honors were still in store for him, and fresh proofs still forthcoming of the con-natural alliance between the dying sect and the one just come into existence. He shortly received another invitation to perform the ceremony of episcopal consecration upon Prof. Reinkens, of Breslau; but, after his sudden death, this function was performed by Bishop Heykamp of Deventer, at Rotterdam August 11, 1873, and a bishopric for the new sect established at Bonn.

Among the apostasies from the Catholic clergy there was not a single bishop; and, besides those already mentioned, only very few *priests*, about forty in all, throughout the whole of Bavaria, the Lower Rhine, Austria, Silesia, and Eastern Prussia. The following of laymen whom these faithless priests carried with them was comparatively small, and not distinguished for either earnestness of devotion or correctness of life. They find little to edify them in the new worship, and will probably soon have cause to regret a step which they took with intemperate haste. Having learned their mistake, they no doubt think it a cruelty that, having rarely frequented the House of God in their previous lives, they must now, to save appearances, and because they have committed themselves, be seen regularly at the conventicles of men.

The conduct of *Dr. Schulte*, formerly Professor of Canon and German Law at the University of Prague, and, since his apostasy, appointed by the government of Berlin to a professorship at the University of Bonn, is still more insidious and dangerous. All his energies seem to be directed toward making civil governments suspicious of papal infallibility, by impressing upon the minds of statesmen the idea that the world is threatened with a revival of papal supremacy in both the temporal and spiritual orders, notwithstanding the fact that both the bishops and the Pope have repeatedly said that infallible *ex cathedra* utterances are limited to the domain of *faith and morals*. Moreover, the judicial suzerainty exercised by the Popes during the Middle Ages had no connection with the doctrine of infallibility. It was the *Jus publicum* of those times, and rested upon the consent of nations and their *compacts* with the Church. Nations then were Christian, and they appealed in the settlement of their quarrels in the last resort to him who was at once the Head of the Church

Hosted by Google

and the recognized Father of Christendom. While the one prerogative is essential to his office, and can not be affected by any change or political combination whatever, the exercise of the other is accidental, and must necessarily cease when governments and nations cease to be Christian. And, in matter of fact, the only words addressed by *Pius IX.* to the French nation and King William of Prussia, during the late events in which these two countries have been engaged, were words of human sympathy and Christian charity. Hence the Archbishop of Tours, who was the bearer of his message to France, made use of these words: "The Pope does not complain that people no longer make him their judge; he only claims the liberty of weeping over our evils and the right to plead for the lives of his sons." [1] Moreover, the Pope has time and again declared that such apprehensions are entirely unfounded, and that "*the Papacy no longer thinks of reviving the supremacy exercised by it during the Middle Ages.*" Pius IX. even took occasion to bring up this matter in a public audience of July 20, 1871, when he spoke substantially as follows: It has been attempted, he said, to falsify the idea of infallibility, by associating with it the right to depose princes and to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance. This right, he went on to say, was indeed exercised in a few extreme cases, but it has no connection whatever with infallibility. It was a consequence of the *Jus publicum* then in force among Christian nations, which recognized the Holy See as the supreme court of appeal for Christendom, and conceded to the Pope the right to pass judgment upon princes and peoples, as well in temporal as in spiritual affairs. But circumstances are wholly changed now, and it is simply malicious to represent as applicable to the present age a papal prerogative, which was only possible under a very exceptionable state of affairs. There are those who desire me to give a still more precise explanation of the decree of infallibility, but I do not think it necessary, as the decree itself is quite plain and explicit to him who reads it with an unbiased mind.[2]

In *France*, the congenial home of Gallicanism, there was, contrary to all anticipation, less agitation than in Germany. Inasmuch as the Gallicans have been traditionally averse to any increase of papal power, and to the centralization of ecclesiastical authority in Rome, the acquiescence with which the decree of infallibility was there received was a surprise to every one; and the more so because Bishop *Dupanloup*, before setting out for the Council, had predicted just the contrary.[3] He did his best to keep the question of infallibility from being brought before the Council, and by his letters to *Deschamps*, Archbishop of Malines, on the same subject,[4] was mainly instrumental in having the respected Père *Gratry* write and publish his four *Historico-dogmatical Letters* against papal infallibility. What Père Gratry did for the Archbishop of Malines, at the suggestion of the Bishop of Orléans, *Maret*, Dean of the Theological Faculty of Paris and titular Bishop of Sura, did for *Darboy*, Arch-

[1] Cf. *Fessler*, The True and False Infallibility.

[2] Pastoral Papers of the Archdiocese of Munich, July 27, 1871.

[3] Cf. *Lord Acton*, The Vatican Council, Germ. trans., by *Dr. Reisch*, p. 46.

[4] The documents relative to this and other kindred subjects may be found in *Friedberg*, pp. 19–21.

Hosted by Google

bishop of Paris.[1] Still, after the doctrine had been once defined and promulgated, Archbishop Darboy, Bishop Maret, and, shortly before his death, Père Gratry, all submitted to the authority of the Council and accepted its decrees. Finally, Bishop Dupanloup, in a pastoral to his clergy, dated June 29, 1872, in which he *officially* published the Vatican decrees, stated "that although he had opposed the dogma of papal infallibility on the ground that it was *inopportune* to proclaim it, he had never ceased to profess it." He at the same time designated the errors of *pantheism* and *materialism* condemned by the Council as the disgrace of the present age and the peril of the future. The only notable names of those of the French clergy who passed over to the Neo-Jansenist party were Père *Hyacinth*, a Carmelite friar; *Michaud*, Chaplain of the Church of Sainte Madeleine; and *Janqua*, an honorary Canon of Bordeaux. The characters of all of them are such that it is a charity to pass them over in silence.

The opposition in *Italy* was led by Conte *Giuseppe Ricciardi*, who attempted the foolish task of holding a counter-council simultaneously with that of the Vatican. By authority of the *Society of Freethinkers* of Milan, this pretentious synod was called to assemble at Naples, where, after holding three sessions, on the 9th, 10th, and 16th of December, it came to an inglorious end, without having accomplished anything.[2] It is but proper to remark, in justice to this august body, that the delegates enjoyed and exercised the fullest freedom of debate, and that, unlike the Fathers of the Vatican Council, they had no tyrannical restrictions placed upon their proceedings. *Père Hyacinth* and the Capuchin, *Fra Andrea d'Altagena*, began an agitation in Rome through the press and from the pulpit, and as their friends in Germany courted an alliance with the Jansenists in Holland, so did they and their followers seek fellowship with the Waldenses of Piedmont.

It is to be hoped that the Vatican Council may be reopened at no distant day for the solution of questions still in doubt, and to provide against the dangers that still menace the Church and retard the conversion of souls.

§ 414. *Revival of Religion in Different Countries since* 1846—*In Portugal and Spain.*

When the Head of the Church is active and energetic, so are also the members. This is analogous to what takes place in nature, and the pontificate of Pius IX. has been a complete verification of the principle. He has communicated his own zeal to the Church in nearly every country of the world, and the result has been a revival of religious life.[3] In

[1] *Père Gratry*, The Bishop of Orléans and the Archbishop of Malines, being four letters (in German, Münster, 1870). See Revue Cath. de Louvain, year 1870, p. 193 sq., art. "De l'infaillibilité du Pape," by *J. B. Lefebve.* (Tr.) *H. L. C. Maret*, Du Concil général et de la paix religieuse, Paris, 1869, 2 vols.

[2] Cf. *Friedberg*, Collection of Documents, etc., p. 21.

[3] Cf. (*A. Niedermayer*) Review, Conflict and Growth of the Church in Our

Hosted by Google

no countries has this revival been less apparent and operative than in *Portugal* and *Spain*, owing chiefly to the civil strife and party conflicts by which these two kingdoms have been agitated.

Portugal has a population of close upon four millions of souls, nearly all of whom are Catholic. It is divided into three ecclesiastical provinces, each having an archbishopric. The Archbishop of *Lisbon* bears the title of *Patriarch*, and the suffragan sees are *Castelbranco*, *Guarda*, *Lamego*, *Leiria* and *Portalegre*, together with the bishoprics of *Angra*, in Terceira, one of the Azores; *Funchal*, in Madeira; *Santiago*, in the most considerable of the Cape Verde Islands; *St. Thomas*, in the island of the same name, and *Angola*, on the Guinea coast, with the bishop's residence at Laonda. The suffragan sees of the Archbishop and Primate of *Braga* are *Aveiro*, *Braganza*, *Miranda*, *Coimbra*, *Oporto*, *Pinhel*, and *Vizeu*. Those of the archbishopric of *Evora* are *Beja*, *Elvas*, and *Faro*. As in other Catholic countries, so also in Portugal, the crown enjoys the privilege of nominating to vacant sees. Some difficulties, which arose in 1856, concerning the nomination to bishoprics in the East India colonies, were settled by compromise between the crown of Portugal and the Holy See, but the Portuguese government steadily opposed all efforts to bring about a Concordat.

On the 3d of July, 1862, *Pius IX.* sent a letter to the bishops of Portugal, in which he pointed out the evils afflicting the Church in that country, earnestly exhorting them to be zealous in the discharge of their duties; to watch carefully over the manners of the clergy; to maintain discipline; to see to it that candidates for the priesthood were well educated and properly trained; and to allow no works not approved by the Church to be put into the hands of those studying theology. Their attention was also called to the necessity of restoring discipline in the monasteries, of looking after the religious education of the youth, and of instructing the people by word and edifying them by example. In closing his letter, the Pope reproves the bishops of Portugal for not coming to Rome to take part in the solemnities of the canonization

Day, being a New Year's Greeting, Freibg. 1862. (Here and there rather exuberant.) By the *same*, "*Ecclesiastical Review*," in the several numbers of "*The Catholic*" of Mentz.

Hosted by Google

of June 8, 1862, and for neglecting to write to apologize for their absence and express their sympathy and approval.

The position of the bishops and clergy of Portugal, it must be said, is one of extreme difficulty. The government being in the hands of the dominant liberal party, is of course hostile to the Church, and takes every opportunity to thwart her interests and to weaken the efficiency of her institutions. In the Roman question its sympathies were with the enemies of the Holy See, and this attitude of hostility has been strengthened and confirmed by the marriage of the young King *Dom Luiz* to a daughter of the late Victor Emmanuel. The most deplorable evil in the Church of Portugal, whether at home or in its dependent colonies, appears to be the urgent *need of priests*, who are not sufficiently numerous to perform even the most necessary ministrations. It is frequently necessary to have laymen administer Baptism and to assist at the ceremony of marriage. Convents of men have now wholly disappeared from the land, and the same fate will shortly overtake those of women, from the fact that by a law of 1834 no more candidates are allowed to enter them. Even the Sisters of Charity, who are mostly French, were brutally driven from Lisbon in 1858, and were forced to ask the protection of France.

The *Catholic* papers published in Portugal are the following: The *Naçao*, at Lisbon, the organ of the Legitimists, whose editor, Eugenio de Locis, sent an address to Pius IX. in October, 1860, to which 58,994 signatures were attached; the *Dirito*, at Oporto; the *Uniao Catholica* (weekly), at Braga; the *Bem Publico* (weekly) and the *Fe Catholica* (bi-monthly) at Lisbon; the *Os Filhos de Maria*, at Oporto; and the *Bibliographia Critica*, a Portuguese enterprise, started by *A. Coetho*, in 1872. As a rule, the editors of these papers make a very successful stand against the hostile liberal press of the country.[1]

Pius IX. has always taken the liveliest interest in the affairs of *Spain*, and openly professed the warmest sympathy with this eminently Catholic nation. He sent thither a Nuncio in 1847, mainly with a view to filling the vacant episcopal sees. Of course there were difficulties. These were adjusted in Rome in 1848; but the instrument was not ratified by Spain

[1] *Silsa*, Dicionario bibliographico Portuguez, etc., 7 vols., Lisbon, 1858 sq.

Hosted by Google

until 1859, after many difficulties had been removed, and was not formally made part of the law of the State until the 4th of April, 1860. It was then accepted as an integral part of the Concordat of 1851. By the bull *In celsissima*, of September 26, 1861, the Pope established bishoprics at *Vitoria*, *Madrid*, and *Ciudad Real;* raised *Valladolid* to an archbishopric; and made a new division of the dioceses of Spain. By the new arrangement the ecclesiastical province of *Burgos* has six suffragan sees, *Compostella* five, *Granada* five, *Saragossa* five, *Seville* four, *Tarragona* seven, *Toledo* six, *Valencia* five, and *Valladolid* five. Apart from the bishops there are about 40,000 priests and sixteen millions of Catholics. The parish-priests are appointed by the Crown, the selection in each case to be made from *three* candidates presented by the bishop. In the appointment of bishops the Crown presents three candidates to the Pope, one of whom is chosen to fill the vacant see. Owing to the secularization and confiscation of ecclesiastical property in Spain, this country, like Portugal, has also begun to feel the need of priests, there being on an average one parish-priest and two curates to every 10,000 souls. There is also a striking similarity between the policies of the two countries in their attitude toward the older Religious Orders, the Liberals in both kingdoms being intensely hostile to them. In 1864 there were, however, still existing male *congregations* of Piarists, Lazarists, Oratorians, Recollects, and Jesuits; and of the older Orders, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Discalced Franciscans. The number of virgins consecrated to God is far greater and steadily on the increase, whereas the male religious are rapidly decreasing. In 1861 there were 1,746 male religious in Spain, and in 1864 this number had fallen to 1,258. On the other hand, the number of inclosed nuns in 1867, not including, of course, 2,000 Sisters of Charity, was 15,000. While it can not be denied that the intellectual culture of the clergy has been far below what it should be, and that the religious instruction of the people has been greatly neglected, it must also be admitted, on the other hand, if statistics are to count for anything, that the standard of morality is high among all classes. The Spaniards, too, have at all times been warmly attached to the Pope

Hosted by Google

and loyal to the Holy See. There is a remarkable evidence of this fidelity in the proceedings of the Spanish Congress of the year 1861. When the policy of Count Cavour came up for discussion, *Martinez de la Rosa*, the President of the Congress, and a pronounced Liberal, subjected it to a most searching and caustic criticism, and, in a speech of remarkable eloquence, declared himself in favor of the Temporal Power of the Pope.

Since the premature death of the celebrated publicist, *Donoso Cortès*, and *James Balmes*, the great philosopher and apologist, few writers of mark have appeared in Spain. Among the best known are *Fr. Xav. Muñoz*, author of the *Manuale Isagogicum in S. Biblia*, 1868; *Leo Carbonero y Sol;* and the distinguished lady *Böhl de Faber*, who, under the pseudonym of *Fernan Caballero*, published many novels and romances, with a view to revive the religious aspirations and patriotic sentiments of her countrymen. Among the numerous periodicals devoted to the service of the Church the following are worthy of special mention: The *Revue Catholique* and *Diario*, of *Barcelona*; the *Epoca* and *Regeneracion*, of Madrid; the *Union*, of Valencia; and the series of *Catholic Pamphlets*, the first of which was published in 1848 at Barcelona. The association formed at Barcelona for the publication of this series had issued in 1864 one hundred and fourteen larger works, eighty smaller ones, and fifty pamphlets. In spite of the numerous pronunciamentos, the frequent revolts, and the many ministerial changes that have of late years taken place in Spain, these publications have done a vast deal of good in stimulating and promoting Catholic life among the people.

The progress of the Church was materially retarded by the revolt of the navy off Cadiz on the 19th of September, 1868, and the consequent overthrow of the hereditary dynasty. In September, 1869, during the regency of Marshal Serrano, the Minister of Justice announced his intention of reducing the number of archbishoprics to five and that of bishoprics to thirty-five. Under the elective King *Amadeus*, son of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, fresh changes were made in the

Hosted by Google

ministry, and in 1872 a civil war broke out, in which *Don Carlos* placed himself at the head of the party opposed to the existing government. Upon the abdication of King Amadeus, in March, 1873, a Republic was proclaimed, which struggled to maintain itself against both the *Carlists* in the North and the *Intransigentes* in the South,[1] until *Alfonso XII.*, son of Isabella II., having been proclaimed by the army King of Spain (January, 1875), the legitimist pretender, *Don Carlos*, was driven into exile.

§ 415. *In France.*

Cf. Napoleon III. and the Catholic Church in France (*Historico-Political Papers*, 1861, in several nros.) † *Hettinger*, The Ecclesiastical and Social Condition of Paris, Mentz, 1852. (This is a silent refutation of the work of *Alban Stolz*, entitled *Spanish Affairs*, in which the author is unsparing in his censures of everything French.)

There is no Catholic country that possesses such a wealth of ecclesiastical establishments and religious congregations as France; nor is there any Catholic country that at all approaches her for the number and importance of the religious enterprises she sets on foot and carries into execution. The political events that took place there in 1848 were not without their influence upon the Church. First of all, the Republic, under the presidency of Louis Napoleon, by a law of March 27, 1850, regulating *Public Instruction*, abolished the monopoly of education enjoyed by the French University, and through the persevering efforts of M. de Falloux and his friend, Count de Montalembert, granted liberty of teaching. Next, when the Republic was overthrown and the Empire set up in its room, December 2, 1852, Louis Napoleon, who became its first Emperor, under the title of *Napoleon III.*, without abolishing the *Organic Laws*,[2] allowed the Church a fair field and unrestrained freedom of action. The *Pantheon*, around which cluster so many memories, was restored to its original purpose, and, under the patronage of Ste. Geneviève, became a favorite place of religious worship. His zeal in promoting the interests of the Church was also manifest in

[1] *Victor Cherbuliez*, l'Espagne politique (1868–1873), Paris, 1874. See Archives of *Catholic Canon Law*, Vol. 28, p. 172, and Vol. 29, p. 30.

[2] See p. 657 sq.

Hosted by Google

the provisions he made for building new churches and restoring those that were going to decay. The church of St. Clotilde, at Paris, built in the Gothic style, was wholly his work. Among those restored by him were Notre Dame and St. Denys at Paris, and others at Tours, Rheims, Amiens, Chartres, Sens, Poitiers, and in other cities of France. At his suggestion, new bishoprics were established in France and Algiers, and proper religious ministrations provided for the army. But, on the other hand, about the year 1860, his attitude toward the Pope gave rise to grave suspicions, which were shown by subsequent events to have been well founded; for the French army, which had been provided for the Pope's protection in 1849, was virtually withdrawn in 1866. *Louis Veuillot* and others of the *Univers* school, who, together with the great majority of the clergy, had given their unqualified support to the Emperor after the *coup d'état* of 1852, began now to take alarm and to give expression to their apprehensions. The Liberal Party, under the lead of Montalembert, Lenormand, Cochin, de Broglie, Foisset, and the other writers on the staff of the *Correspondant* newspaper, had declined from the very outset to give any sort of sanction to what they designated the "successful crime." Poujoulat, Capefigue, Laurentie, Henri de Riancey, and notably *Berryer*, the representatives of the Legitimist Party, were still more emphatic and outspoken in their opposition to the new Empire.

Amid all these religious and political changes France still continued to be an object of special solicitude to Pius IX. In an allocution, delivered September 11, 1848, he deplored the death of *Denys d'Affre*, Archbishop of Paris, who was killed on the barricades, vainly attempting to prevent the effusion of blood and to restore peace. In a brief, dated March 21, 1853, he praised the French bishops for their zeal in holding provincial councils, restoring the Roman Liturgy in their dioceses, and for their devotion to the Holy See. By the bull *Ubi primum*, of January 5th, he raised the see of *Rennes* to the rank of an archbishopric, with Quimper, Vannes, and St. Brieux as its suffragans. New sees were established at Laval and Réunion, and in 1866 *Algiers* was raised to an archbishopric, having for its suffragans Oran and Constantine. By the accession of Nizza and Savoy to the Empire, the archbish-

Hosted by Google

opric of Chambéry and its three suffragan sees, together with the exempt see of Nizza, became part of the Church of France, in which there are at present seventeen ecclesiastical provinces and thirty-six millions of Catholics. The bishops as a body are most worthy men, wonderfully energetic, and many of them are gifted with splendid mental endowments and distinguished for their learning, their eloquence, and their firmness of character. Gallicanism, which, during the days of the July government, showed so many portentous signs of returning life, has become nearly, if not quite extinct. Laboring by the side of the bishops is a body of clergy remarkable for the purity of their lives, the dignity of their manners, and their zeal in saving souls. They are highly esteemed by the people, which is the very best proof that they deserve to be so.

The *Religious* of both sexes zealously at work in France are very numerous. Putting aside the many communities of women, the Benedictines, Dominicans, Jesuits, Capuchins, Carthusians, and Trappists, among the greater Orders, have establishments in the country. The religious *Congregations* of men, to some of which the State has given its approval, are still more numerous. Of these it will be sufficient to name the Lazarists, Sulpicians, and Christian Brothers. In the year 1854, 243,699 pupils attended the schools under the care of the *Brothers of Christian Doctrine*, and 77,600 the schools in charge of other communities of Brothers; and in the interval between 1854 and 1866 the number of their schools had increased 500. In 1860, previously to the annexation of Savoy, there were in France 2,972 houses of female Religious. Of these the inmates of 553 were entirely devoted to the education of youth; of 302 entirely to the care of the sick; of 2,101 to both these offices combined; and of 16 to contemplation and the perpetual adoration of God in the Blessed Sacrament. Close upon two-thirds of the girls of France are educated by Sisters of various Orders, a fact which will account for the appreciation which is there put upon Christian home life. The *Ladies of the Sacred Heart*, the *Augustinian* and *Ursuline Nuns*, have earned an enviable reputation as teachers in the higher branches of female education. Much has been

Hosted by Google

done to preserve a high standard of Christian morality among the people by the *Society of St. Vincent de Paul.* This society is under the supervision of a president, resident at Paris, and has affiliated conferences in all the cities of France and in some of the more important towns.[1]

The *Society of St. Francis Regis* has also done an immense deal of good. Its object is to unite those living in concubinage in lawful marriage, to secure them as man and wife their civil and ecclesiastical rights, to legitimate their children, to restore to them those that had been placed in a foundling-house, and, by thus placing them on a proper footing in both Church and State and reconciling them to their families, save them from utter ruin and make them useful members of society. Akin to this is the *Society for the Protection of Unfortunate Young Girls*, whose virtue is exposed to special temptation. To those who live at a distance this society supplies the means to enable them to return to their homes. To reclaim those who have fallen the *Sisters of the Good Shepherd* and of the *Immaculate Conception* spare neither labor nor personal sacrifice.

The various Congregations and Associations, the sole aim of whose members is to give themselves up to works of *Christian charity*, have a special claim on our sympathy and admiration. Foremost among these, everywhere and at all times since their institution, have stood the *Sisters of Charity*, of *St. Charles Borromeo*, and of *St. Vincent de Paul.* These are to be found wherever the sick are to be ministered unto, the sorrowful to be comforted, or the needy to be relieved. In the war of the Crimea, in the wars in Italy, Mexico, and the United States, and in the late Franco-Prussian war, they won the admiration and gratitude of all by their deeds of heroic charity. The Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, established at Nancy, have for nearly a quarter of a century been doing a world of good in ministering to the wants of the poor Germans of Paris.[2] The work-houses for criminals are under the care of the *Brothers of the Holy Ghost;* the *Brothers of St.*

[1] See p. 400.

[2] *A. Niedermayer*, The Germans of Paris, Freiburg, 1862.

Hosted by Google

Gabriel instruct the deaf and dumb; and abandoned or lost children are sought out and provided for by the *Brothers of St. Joseph.* Blind children are educated by the *Sisters of St. Paul*, nearly all of whom are themselves blind; and the labors of the *Sisters of Nazareth and Bethlehem* extend to the holy places whence they take their names. The special object of the *Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul*, recently founded, is to promote the religious observance of Sundays, but also to take charge of orphan boys. The object of the *Society of the Holy Childhood*, founded by Bishop Janson, of Nancy, is to provide means to rescue children exposed in China, to baptize them, and, in case of death, to bury them as Christians.. Baron Conchy founded the *Schools of the Orient*, into which children, lost or abandoned by their parents in Mohammedan countries, are gathered and cared for. In striking contrast with these splendid achievements inspired by faith, with these sublime manifestations of Catholic life, with these magnificent witnesses of the charity of which Paris possesses such a wealth, are the demoralization, the frivolity, the impiety, which one meets with in nearly every walk of life in their most repulsive forms. Whether in good deeds or evil France is equally great. While the Catholic is disposed to look at her fairer and better side, and to describe with pardonable enthusiasm the marvelous creations of the religious zeal and charity of her true sons,[1] tourists and novel-writers, more frivolous than the most frivolous of the French, take a cynical delight in exposing vice and scandal, which they have been at pains to seek out; and, after dressing them up in all the circumstance of detail with a wealth and richness of imagery and a copiousness and beauty of diction worthy a higher theme, they send them forth into the world as the "Mysteries of the Modern Babylon."

But France was not content with having prosperous and beneficent associations within the limits of her own territory. Her great people desired the conversion of idolatrous nations, and for this purpose they gave generously of their blood and treasure. The *Missionary Society of Lyons* collects four

[1] Cf. *Hettinger*, letter 10, pp. 167 sq.

Hosted by Google

millions of francs annually in France alone for the support of the foreign missions, and sends forth of the sons of France more missionaries than do all the other nations of Europe put together.

During the pontificate of Pius IX. great advances have been made in the scientific treatment of religious truths. Among those who have been conspicuous in this field are the learned and eloquent pulpit orators *Bautain*, *Lacordaire*, O. P., and *Ravignan*, S. J., who labored with a large measure of success to lead the minds of men back to Catholic teaching, and to demonstrate that every high and noble aspiration of the age, whether as regards liberty, or science, or art, or social reforms, or the regeneration of Europe, could be realized and made enduring by and through the Church and in no other way. They were followed in the same line of argument by *Felix*, S. J.; *Minjard;* and the ex-Carmelite, *Hyacinth.* There were also many bishops distinguished for pulpit eloquence, of whom the best known are *Dupanloup*, Bishop of Orléans; *Pie*, Bishop of Poitiers; and *Landriot*, Archbishop of Rheims. Among the other important names in religious literature are those of Abbé *Ségur; Nicolas*,[1] the jurist; *Keller*,[2] a deputy from Alsace; and *Guizot*, the Protestant Minister of Louis Philippe, whose *Méditations chrétiennes* and *l'Église et la société chrétienne* exercised a wide and beneficial influence upon the minds of the better classes.

The aim of M. *Renan*, the Oriental scholar, is directly antagonistic to that of the authors just quoted. In his *Life of Jesus*, his *Apostles*, his *St. Paul*, his *Antichrist*, and his recently published *Gospels*, all being contributions to his *History of the Origins of Christianity*,[3] he has renewed the oft-repeated attempt to strip Christianity of its supernatural character, its Founder of His divinity, and the New Testament miracles of their claims to credibility. Many able apologists at once came forward to defend the principles and the facts that form the groundwork of their faith. They were not long in dissipating

[1] *Nicolas*, Études sur le christianisme.

[2] *Keller*, l'Église et les principes de 1789; Church, State, and Liberty (in Germ.), Mentz, 1866.

[3] See the *Nation* of Sept. 20, 1877. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

the illusive charm which the Eastern dreamer had thrown about his sentimental and blasphemous works. The Abbé, now Bishop, *Freppel;* Père *Gratry;* Archbishop *Darboy*, of Paris; Bishop *Meignan*, of Châlons; and *Pressensé*, a Protestant theologian, were among the most eminent of Renan's opponents. In the French Senate, Marshal *Canrobert* stated that he hoped no one of that body would express the slightest sympathy with one who had dared to deny the divinity of Christ and proclaim himself the uncompromising enemy of the faith of their fathers, which has been at all times the religion of the great bulk of the French people. For himself, he said, he formally protested against so wicked a doctrine.

The necessity of making *philosophical studies* more severely methodical was now generally conceded; and, after the publication of the works of Bautain, Bonald, and Bonnetty, none of which exercised any decisive influence on public thought, Père *Gratry* published his writings on the same subjects.[1] But even he was not entirely successful in separating the theological from the strictly philosophical. One gain, however, had been made: the *Traditionalism* introduced by *Lamennais*, and supported in a modified form by Bautain, Bonnetty, and Père Chastel, S. J., became virtually extinct. In the study of *theology*, many, following the example of *Lacordaire*, took as their author St. Thomas; while others, like *Ginoulliac*, studied still more ancient writers. Great progress was made in the study of moral theology by *Carrière*, the Superior of St. Sulpice; Cardinal *Gousset;* and Father *Gury*, S. J.[2] Taking Liguori for their guide, they broke through the tyranny of Jansenistic rigorism so prevalent in France ever since its origin down almost to our own days. *Bouix*[3] wrote on Canon Law; and *Rohrbacher*, *Blanc*, *Darras*, *Renier*, and others on general Church history. Some excellent monographies, treating of

[1] His philosophical writings are: 1. *On the Knowledge of the Soul;* 2. *On the Knowledge of God;* 3. *On the Knowledge of Man, considered in his Intellectual Endowments.* (Transl. into Germ. by Dr. *Phahler*, Ratisbon, 6 vols.)

[2] Vie du Père *J. P. Gury*, Paris and Lyons, 1867. (Tr.)

[3] De principiis juris canonici, Paris, 1852. He has also written tracts, De Episcopo, De Capitulis, De Jure Regularium, and other subjects; and Revue des Sciences ecclésiastiques.

Hosted by Google

particular periods and persons, ecclesiastical institutions and countries, were written by *Gorini*,[1] *Poujoulat*, *Colombet*, *Rochel*, *Ratisbonne*, *Davin*, *Castan*, *Samon*, *Jager*, *Montalembert*, *Crétineau-Joly*, *Albert de Broglie*, *Capefigue*, *Prat*, and *Dom Piolin*. In exegetics and the study of the original Hebrew and Greek texts much was accomplished by Père *de Valroger*[2] and Père *Gratry*,[3] *le Hir*, Professor at the Sorbonne, *J. B. Glaire*,[4] *Bargès*, *Gainet*,[5] and Bishop *Meignan*,[6] the last named being intimately acquainted with the Biblical literature of Germany.

To the energy, courage, and indomitable perseverance of the Abbé *Migne*, Catholics are indebted for a complete edition of the works of the Latin Fathers of the Church down to Innocent III. (1215), in 217 vols., quarto; and of the Greek Fathers, down to the sixteenth century, in 162 vols. Although these editions are not quite satisfactory in textual accuracy, they have, nevertheless, been of great service in facilitating the study of ecclesiastical literature.[7] The edition of the works of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, published by the *Gaume Bros.*, after the text of the Benedictine editions, are open to the same objection. It must be added, however, that the *Spicilegium Solesmense* (4 vols.) and the *Jus Graecum* (2 vols.) of the Benedictine, *Dom Pitra*, are of unusual merit, and like praise may be given to other works of the Reformed Congregation of Benedictines, as, for example, *Origines de l'Église de Rome* and the *liturgical writings* of *Dom Guéranger*. *Caillau* and *Guillon*, Bishop *Cruice* of Marseilles, Abbé *Freppel*, and *Dr. Nolte*, a German by birth, were all successful and learned patristic students; while *Villemain* and *Charpentier* contributed by their writings to diffuse a taste for a study of the Fathers of the Church. *Gallia Christiana* and *Histoire littéraire de la France*, works begun in

[1] Défense de l'église, 4 vols.

[2] Introduction aux liveres du N. T.

[3] Commentaires sur St. Matthieu.

[4] Introduction hist. et crit. de l'ancien et nouveau Test.

[5] Histoire de l'ancien et du nouveau Test.

[6] Les prophéties messianiques.

[7] *Migne's* publications are discussed in detail in the art. of *Hergenröther*, in Reusch's Periodical of Theolog. Literat., 1867, Nos. 10 and 13.

Hosted by Google

the last century by the Benedictines, and left off in consequence of the Revolution, were again taken up and continued by the members of the same Order in the present century. *Victor Palmé* has published a splendid edition of the Lives of the Saints by the *Bollandists*, more than sixty volumes, folio, having already appeared. A powerful stimulus was given to the study of the Christian Middle Ages by the *École des chartes* and the *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, edited by de Wailly, Delisle, Quicherat, Boutaric, and others.

In *Christian antiquities* much of an important character was accomplished by Raoul-Rochette, Charles and Francis Lenormand, Coc, Greppe, Labus, *Perret*,[1] *Martigny*,[2] and Didron;[3] Texier, Renier, and particularly *Le Blant*, gained eminence in the study of *Christian epigraphics;* and for their histories of architecture, sculpture, and painting, Gailhabaud and Cahours, Jesuits, and *de Caumont*, *Rio*,[4] and *Viollet-le-duc* acquired some celebrity. The last named was a warm advocate of Gothic architecture. Finally, *Lambillotte* labored earnestly to promote the study of church music.

There are French *periodicals* representing nearly every branch of ecclesiastical science. *Études religieuses, historiques et littéraires* was founded by the Jesuit Fathers *Daniel* and *Gagarin*, and, until the close of 1871, edited by *de Buck*, a Belgian, and one of the ablest men in the Society. There were also the *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* and the *Correspondant*, the latter under the direction of Count Montalembert († 1870). Of the professedly *political journals*, those most zealous in the Catholic cause are *Le Monde*, founded in 1860; *L'Union*, edited by Laurentie, Henri *de Riancey*, his brother Charles, lately dead, and Poujoulat; the *Journal des villes et Campagnes* and *L'Univers*, which was suppressed in 1860, and superseded by *Le Monde*, but again appeared in 1867, under the editorial management of *Louis Veuillot*, who is also the author of *Les Parfums de Rome*; and the lately suspended *Revue Catholique de*

[1] Catacombes de Rome, 6 vols., large fol., with many colored lithographs and fac-similes of Christian inscriptions. (Tr.)

[2] Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes.

[3] Annales archéologiques.

[4] De l'Art chrétien.

Hosted by Google

l'Alsace. *Montalembert*, in speaking of the death of Lacordaire, represented his dead friend as believing that both the *Civiltà Cattolica* and *L'Univers* were too mediaeval in their tendencies, a charge which it is somewhat difficult to understand.

On the 14th of April, 1872, *Pius IX.* reproved all editors who, in their ardent advocacy of a cause, forgot the laws of charity.

§ 416. *In Belgium and Holland.*

Belgium, which is French in language and character, is also French in its manifestations of religious life. Like France, Belgium has a wealth of *charitable associations*, possesses a large number of *religious houses*, and contributes abundantly to the work of the *foreign missions*. In 1829 there were in the country 280 houses of Religious; in 1846 the number had increased to 779, and since then it has been considerably augmented. As in France, so also in Belgium, there exists, side by side with the most cheering evidences of a healthy religious life, indubitable signs of a *corruption* as deep and repulsive as it could well be. These are visible in the license of the press; in an intemperate hostility to the Catholic Church, to priests and to Religious; and in an avowed purpose to overturn the Church and clear the country of the last remnant of Christianity. Such was the diabolical spirit that actuated the so-called *Liberals*, the four thousand *Freemasons*, and the sect of the *Solidaires*, when they pledged themselves as a body and individually not to call a priest to their bedside when dying, nor to permit one to be called to any of their associates. In a *congress held at Liége* in 1866, mainly composed of students, they professed the grossest atheism, naturalism, and communism. These professions were so alarming that the French government thought it worth while to take measures against such of its subjects as participated in the congress.

In 1857, on the occasion of the passage of the *law relative to charitable institutions*,[1] the mob, incited by the attacks of the

[1] *Freiburg* Eccl. Gazette, year 1857, nros. 5 and 6.

Hosted by Google

liberal press, committed deeds of scandalous violence against churches and the houses of Religious. These excesses were again on the point of breaking out in 1864, after the notorious *de Buck lawsuit*,[1] but were prevented by the decision and energy of the magistracy. At a time when every other class of citizens were coerced on account of their religion, the Freemasons enjoyed the fullest liberty, and might hold public meetings and march in procession through the streets without hindrance. As is usual, however, the *Jesuits* were the first to feel the effects of these revolutionary outbreaks. In the twelve colleges under their charge they were educating two thousand young men belonging to the better families of the country. This it was that gave offense at the Lodges, whose aim is "*to destroy Catholicity and to extinguish the very idea of Christianity*," and whose members are under oath "*to pursue kings and religious charlatans* with a never-ending hatred, as the pests of society and the world." But Belgium is not wholly composed of enemies of the Church and disturbers of the public peace; her population is essentially conservative and religious. Their faith is kept strong and vigorous, and their good works are directed and encouraged by an exemplary and active priesthood and by a prosperous regular clergy of exceptional zeal. Here as elsewhere the pious and noble congregations of women are numerous and flourishing. In the Chambers the Catholic party is fully the equal of the Liberal party in both numbers and ability; and a well organized Catholic press, of exceptional energy and talent, opposes successfully the assaults of the licentious press of the Liberals. Among the ablest conducted journals on the Catholic side are the *Journal de Bruxelles*, the *Journal d'Anvers*, the *Patrie* of Bruges, the *Bien public* of Ghent, the *Moniteur* of Louvain, *L'Ami de l'Ordre* of Namur, *Le Courrier de la Sambre*, *L'Union de Charleroy*, *Le Nouvelliste de Verviers*, etc.

The *University of Louvain* holds the first place among the *Catholic educational establishments* of Belgium. Its history has been one of uninterrupted success. When opened in 1835 it

[1] The de Buck Lawsuit at Brussels before the Tribunal of Truth, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1865.

Hosted by Google

had an attendance of eighty-six students. This number has been increasing under the successive rectors—*de Ram*, who died in 1865; *Laforêt*, who died in 1871; and *Namèche*, the present incumbent—the total number attending all the "faculties" being now about eight hundred. Its course of scientific studies is published annually in the University report,[1] and the best productions of its professors are given to the world in the *Revue Catholique de Louvain.*

A fresh impulse was given to religious life in Belgium by the *Catholic Congress* of Malines, first held in 1863. There were about 4,000 persons present, representing every class of society and various nationalities. There were representatives there from France and Spain, from Portugal and England, and from Germany and the United States.[2] Although primarily intended to be a Congress of laymen, many priests and bishops participated in the proceedings, to which a special significance was given by the able speeches of Bishop *Dupanloup*, Cardinal *Wiseman*, and Count *Montalembert*, on *religious liberty.* Science, art, charities, and popular education were discussed in special *Committees;* but the subject of the "*daily press*," which has become one of such vital importance to Catholics, excited more interest and claimed a larger share of attention than any other question. These Congresses, if continued, will tend to organize the Catholics of Belgium, and will enable them to provide against threatened dangers in both Church and State.

The progress of Catholicity in *Holland*, though more silent, is not less real and solid than in Belgium. The *restoration of the hierarchy* in 1853 by *Pius IX.*, in spite of the remonstrances and indignant protests of the Calvinists and Jansenists, put fresh life and vigor into the Church and Catholics of that country. The opposition to this measure was so bitter and persistent that the government instructed its embassador at Rome to use his influence to have the act revoked. The

[1] *L'annuaire de l'université catholique* contains, beside a *schema* of the course of studies, statistics concerning professors and students, promotions made, obituaries of deceased members of the Faculties, etc.

[2] *A. Niedermayer*, Malines and Würzburg, being Sketches and Pen Pictures made in the Catholic Congresses of Belgium and Germany, Freiburg, 1865.

Hosted by Google

Catholics had now an archiepiscopal see at *Utrecht*, the very citadel of Jansenism, the suffragan sees being *Haarlem*, *Herzogenbosch*, *Breda*, and *Roermonde*. By the Constitution of 1848, *liberty of conscience* was granted to the people of Holland, and this measure was shortly followed by the enactment of a liberal *school-law*. Of course the Catholics made the best of the advantages thus placed within their reach by at once establishing schools and giving them in charge to Religious Orders, whose number was now increased. The Bishop of Roermonde, besides his clerical seminary at *Rolduc*, established a seminary for young men intended for the scholastic profession, in which he provided for the education of thirty students. The Religious Orders, which re-entered the country only in 1830, possessed in 1862 thirty-eight convents of men, including the houses of the Jesuits, and one hundred and thirty-seven of women. Of the latter the Ursulines of Tildonk, in Belgium, and the Sisters of Charity of Tilburg devote themselves chiefly to the education of young ladies. The Protestants naturally took alarm at the growth of Catholicity, once it had been given a fair field, and made a futile attempt to have a law passed making education at once free and compulsory. As it was, the government inspectors of schools, who were mainly Protestant, gave no little annoyance to Catholics in the matter of education, and never missed an opportunity to place obstacles in the way of their advance. But the bishops and clergy, both secular and regular, were active and vigilant, and rarely failed to baffle these attempts. The Catholics, too, fully appreciated the advantages of the press; it gave them an opportunity of setting themselves right before the *public*. Books, magazines, newspapers, and almanacs, treating of current subjects, and written in a popular style, began to pour from the printing-press, and grew in number as days went on. In theological literature the Dutch also produced some works of merit, as, for example, the *Moral Theology* of *Van de Velde* and the *Canon Law* of Professor *Van de Burgt*, of Utrecht. Professor *Broere*, the poet and pulpit orator; Dr. *Nuyens;* Professor *Wensing* and *Alberdingk Thijm*, were also authors of distinction. *Habets* and *Willems* acquired some reputation in the field of ecclesiastical, profane,

Hosted by Google

and art history. *De Catholik*, a periodical edited by the professors of theology at Warmond, largely contributes toward keeping literary life active, while the questions of the hour are ably discussed in several newspapers of Limburg and North Brabant, but chiefly in *De Tyd*, of Amsterdam. The results of these efforts have been cheering and abundantly satisfactory, for of the population of Holland, 3,700,000, close upon one-half are now within the pale of the *Catholic* Church. Unhappily, the *Jansenist* schism has been perpetuated down to our own day. In the dioceses of *Utrecht* and *Haarlem* there are about 5,000 Jansenists, distributed into twenty-five congregations. The diocese of Deventer is simply a misnomer, as it contains not a single schismatic congregation. The bishops of these sees have all been excommunicated by Rome. If the aid contributed by France toward the maintenance of the Jansenistic Seminary at Utrecht were cut off, both it and the schism it perpetuates would soon cease to exist. In 1856 the bishops of the Jansenist Church of Holland protested against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and in 1874 formally allied themselves to the Old Catholics of Germany. In spite of the strenuous efforts of the Freemasons of Belgium to retard the progress of the Church in the Grand Duchy of *Luxemburg*, a dependency of Holland, the evidences of reviving life and activity are encouraging and substantial. An episcopal see was established at Luxemburg, June 17, 1870, and facilities afforded by the opening of a *greater Seminary* at the same place for the study of theology, archaeology, and church-music. Catholic interests find able advocates in *La voix de Luxembourg* and other journals of nearly, if not quite equal merit.

§ 417. *In Great Britain and Ireland.*

Dr. Moufang, Card. Wiseman and the Services he rendered to Science and the Church, two lectures, Mentz, 1865. *Dr. Newman, Apologia pro vita sua*, being a Reply to a Pamphlet entitled "What, then, does Dr. Newman Mean?" (translated into German by the Rev. *Schündelen*, Cologne, 1865.)

The prophetic words uttered by the sagacious *Bossuet*, at a time when Anglicans entertained only feelings of intense

Hosted by Google

hatred and malignant hostility toward the Catholic Church, are being verified in our own day. Speaking of the English people, he said: "*A nation so wise can not long remain deluded. Its professed reverence for the Fathers and its deep and patient study of antiquity will lead it back to the teaching of the primitive ages.*" [1] Dr. Newman also refers in his *Apologia* to "'a much venerated clergyman of the last generation,' who said, shortly before his death, '*Depend on it, the day will come when those great doctrines, now buried, will be brought out to the light of day, and then the effect will be fearful.*'" [2]

Nicholas Wiseman and *John Henry Newman* have done more than any other men of the present century to start the movement toward the Catholic Church in England. The religious agitation in England, known as *Puseyism* or the *Tractarian Movement*,[3] which seemed called forth by the Spirit, who breatheth where He will, counted among its promoters clergymen scattered all over the country, and representing almost every shade of social and intellectual life. Speaking of the antecedents of those identified with the Movement, Dr. Newman says:

"Dr. Hook and Mr. Churton represented the high Church dignitaries of the last century; Mr. Perceval, the Tory aristocracy; Mr. Keble came from a country parsonage; Mr. Palmer from Ireland; Dr. Pusey from the Universities of Germany, and the study of Arabic MSS.; Mr. Dodsworth from the study of Prophecy; Mr. Oakley had gained his views, as he himself expressed it, 'partly by study, partly by reflection, partly by conversation with one or two friends, inquirers like himself;' while I speak of myself as being 'much indebted to the friendship of Archbishop Whately.' And thus I am led on to ask," he continues, "'What head of a sect is there? What march of opinions can be traced from mind among preachers such as these? They are one and all, in their degree, the organs of one Sentiment, which has risen simultaneously in many places very mysteriously.'" [4]

[1] *Bossuet*, Histoire des variations des églises protestantes, liv. VII., c. 114.

[2] *Apologia*, etc., New York, 1865, p. 140. (Tr.)

[3] See a full account of the Movement in the *Apologia* of Dr. Newman, Part IV. Dr. Newman began the Tracts, as he says, "out of his own head," and hence the name *Tractarianism*, which was changed to Puseyism after Dr. Pusey joined the Movement, because he became its leader, having qualifications for that office which Newman did not possess. (Tr.)

[4] *Apologia*, etc., pp. 140, 141. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

This Movement, simultaneously set on foot in so many quarters of the kingdom by men of antecedents so various, finally centered in Oxford. From this point its leaders began to propagate their doctrines. Taking the Thirty-nine Articles as a basis, they applied themselves to the study of the Fathers with an eagerness that amounted to enthusiasm, in the hope of removing the vagueness of doctrine and correcting the laxity of discipline, which they felt to be blots upon the Anglican Church. *Justification* and the *Eucharist* were the first subjects to which they turned their thoughts. The fruits of these labors were the *Tracts for the Times*, of which, as Dr. Newman says, he was "the editor and mainly the author."[1] The first of these was issued in 1833. *Apostolic succession* is insisted on as the only mark of the presence of the Holy Ghost; and *ecclesiastical tradition* is set forth as a necessary complement to Scripture in determining precisely and adequately what belongs to the body of Catholic truth. As has been said, the authors of the Movement took the Thirty-nine Articles as the groundwork of their position. They hoped to find them sufficiently elastic to be able to touch the Anglican Church with one extreme of them, and the Catholic, or, as they said, Church of Rome, with the other. In other words, they wished to effect a compromise between the Roman and the Anglican doctrines by principles such as are indicated by the name *Via Media*, which they chose to characterize the drift of the Movement. It was found, however, that this line of argument was impossible, and after the publication of Tract 90, in 1841, it had to be given up. In this Tract the author, *Dr. Newman*, endeavored to prove that the Established Church of England is a branch of the great Catholic Church, and that the Thirty-nine Articles may be harmonized with the Decrees of Trent.[2] About this time the Anglican bishops opposed the publication of the Tracts, and they were in consequence discontinued. Owing to the intellectual diffi-

[1] *Apologia*, p. 88. (TR.)

[2] "It is a duty which we owe both to the Catholic Church, and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit. We have no duty toward their framers." *Apologia*, p. 172. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

culties he felt at not being allowed to put his own sense upon the Articles, Dr. Newman "intended to gradually fall back into Lay Communion," and with this thought before his mind, resigned his parish of St. Mary's, Oxford, in the autumn of 1843, and withdrew into private life at Littlemore. To put an end to what he calls his "vague misgivings" at this period, he "determined to write an *Essay on Doctrinal Development*," [1] which he commenced in the beginning of 1845, and continued working at through the summer. "As I advanced," he says, "my views so cleared that instead of speaking any more of 'the Roman Catholics,' I boldly called them Catholics. Before I got to the end, I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it was then, unfinished." [2] He was received into the Roman Catholic Church October 8, 1845, by Father Dominic, a Passionist. His example was followed by large numbers of the Anglican clergy and of the aristocracy. In 1867 the number of distinguished converts to the Catholic Church in England amounted to 867, of whom 243 had been Anglican ministers. Although *Dr. Pusey* publicly defended the ground taken by Dr. Newman in Tract 90, he has not followed his example in entering the Church of Rome. He clung to the old line of argument, and seemed unable to shake off its contradictory principles. He claimed that it was quite possible to be a Catholic at heart, while one was seemingly a Protestant; and added that the Anglican Church ought to sever all connection with Protestantism, and that, when she had done so, her children ought not to leave her. The Anglican Church was not for him, as for Dr. Newman, a way leading up to the Church of Rome.[3]

[1] *Apologia*, p. 257. (Tr.)

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 261. (Tr.)

[3] "The Church of England has been the instrument of Providence in conferring great benefits on me; had I been born in Dissent, perhaps I should never have been baptized; had I been born an English Presbyterian, perhaps I should never have known our Lord's divinity; had I not come to Oxford, perhaps I should never have heard of the visible Church, or of Tradition, or other Catholic doctrines. And as I have received so much good from the Anglican Establishment itself, can I have the heart, or rather the want of charity, considering that it does for so many others what it has done for me, to wish to see it overthrown?" *Apologia*, p. 322. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

"Soon," says Dr. Newman, "Dr. Wiseman, in whose Vicariate Oxford lay, called me to Oscott, and I went there with others; afterwards he sent me to Rome, and finally placed me in Birmingham." [1]

In 1847 Dr. Newman became a Father of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and began to labor for the Church in England with the spirit and zeal of his patron. In 1850 he organized the *Catholic University* of Dublin, and continued its Rector for five years. He then returned to the House of the Oratory at Birmingham, in connection with which he started a school of higher studies, in which many of the Roman Catholic young men of England have been educated.

Cardinal (then Dr.) *Wiseman* took a lively interest and an active part in the Movement in England toward the Catholic Church. This eminent man was born at Seville, in Spain, of Irish Catholic parents, August 2, 1802. He spent his early years in Ireland, and received his first education at Waterford, whence he passed over to England, spending some time at the College of St. Cuthbert, Ushaw, near Durham. Feeling himself called to the ministry, he, with five other young men, set out for Rome (1818), where he entered the *English College*, just then opened, after having been closed for nearly a generation. Here he remained twenty-two years, laying up that vast store of knowledge, of which, while there, and after his return to England, he turned to such excellent account. His vigorous apologetical and polemical writings, so replete with the gentle and winning grace which charity gives, did a vast deal of good in England. Many of these were published while he was still Rector of the English College at Rome. He returned to England in 1836 to take part in the Tractarian Movement. He subsequently said he "had been surprised, on visiting England in 1835, to find how little attention it had yet excited among Catholics." [2] In 1836, he, together with *Mr. Quin* and *Daniel O'Connell*, commenced the publication of the *Dublin Review*, the aim and scope of which were thus stated by Dr. Wiseman:

[1] *Apologia*, p. 262. (TR.)

[2] Card. *Manning*, Miscellanies, etc., New York, 1877, p. 153. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

"To watch its (the Oxford Movement's) progress; to observe its phases; to influence, if possible, its direction; to move it gently toward complete attainment of its unconscious aims; and, moreover, to protest against its errors; to warn against its dangers; to provide arguments against its new mode of attack; and to keep lifted up the mask of beauty under which it had, in sincerity, covered the ghastly and soulless features of Protestantism;—these were the duties which the new *Review* undertook to perform, or which, in no small degree, it was expressly created to discharge." [1]

The first number appeared in May, 1836.

His *Lectures on the Connection of Science and Revealed Religion* were published this same year, and also his *Lectures on the Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, both of which were well received, and exercised a wide and powerful influence.

In 1840 Dr. Wiseman was appointed Coadjutor Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District of England, with the title of Bishop of *Melipotamus in partibus infidelium*, and, at the same time, was named President of *St. Mary's College of Oscott*, near Birmingham, where he took up his residence. This was then the great seat of Catholic learning in England, and his appointment to so important a charge was hailed with joy by many, who had received the better part of their education under his guidance. One of the works in which he labored most earnestly was to bring the Catholics of England to understand that in believing the teachings of the Church and keeping the Commandments, they were only doing part of their duty; they must also adopt her practices, fall in with her customs, and be in full sympathy with her spirit. These thoughts were brought out with striking force and vigor in a Pastoral he published in 1849.

As has been remarked in a preceding paragraph, Gregory XVI., on the 11th of May, 1840, increased the number of districts from four to eight; and Pius IX., by the bull *Universalis Ecclesiae*, of September 29, 1850, restored the *hierarchy* to England. It consisted of twelve bishoprics and the archbishopric of Westminster,[2] to which Dr. Wiseman was appointed,

[1] Card. *Manning*, Miscellanies, etc., p. 153. (TR.)

[2] The ecclesiastical province consists of the Metropolitan See of Westminster, with the suffragan sees of Beverley, Birmingham, Clifton, Hexham and Newcastle, Liverpool, Menevia and Newport, Northampton, Nottingham, Plymouth, Salford, Shrewsbury, and Southwark. Total of Priests in England and Wales (in 1878), 1,828; of churches, chapels, and stations, 1,076. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

and was at the same time created Cardinal. This measure revived the old hatred of Catholics, and evoked a storm of religious excitement. Catholics were sneered at and insulted; assailed with sarcasm and railery; made the objects of bold and reckless denunciation; dealt with unfairly in the courts of justice, and misrepresented in the pulpits of the Establishment and Dissent; pertinaciously reviled in the newspapers, and violently declaimed against by popular speakers. The cry of "*No Popery*" went up from one end of the kingdom to the other, and mobs were gathered together by the magic of its sound. At the opening of Parliament, in the year 1851, Lord John Russell introduced the *Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill*, by which any one not entitled by law to do so was forbidden to assume or use the name, style, or title of archbishop, bishop, or dean of "any place in the United Kingdom." By the *Class and Convent Bill*, priests and religious were prohibited to appear in public in the dress of their Order, and provision was made for an investigation of convents, to ascertain if any of the inmates were there against their will. It was at this time that Cardinal Wiseman, acting with the firmness and dignity so characteristic of apostolic men, published his celebrated address to Englishmen, entitled *An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the People of England on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy*,[1] and announced his intention of delivering a course of controversial lectures at his cathedral. This firmness is all the more admirable from the fact that at this very time Mr. Reynolds declared in Parliament that "the Anti-Popery agitation has risen to such a height throughout the country that he was astonished the Cardinal had not been burnt in person instead of in effigy." But the Cardinal held his ground, and was not only victorious in the long run, but even extorted the admiration of his countrymen.[2] Conversions became frequent; and in 1851 thirty-three Anglican ministers came into the Church, among whom

[1] Translated into Germ., Ratisbon, 1851. Cf. *Buss*, Hist. of the Persecution of the Cath. Church in England, 1851.

[2] The restoration of the hierarchy was deprecated at that time by many, who confidently asserted that the measure would indefinitely retard the growth of

Hosted by Google

was *Manning*, then one of the most eminent of the Anglican clergy, and *Henry* and *Robert Wilberforce*, brothers of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. The Concordat made about this time between Austria and the Holy See was the occasion of another burst of popular fury, which the Cardinal succeeded in calming by a second course of lectures on Concordats.[1] He held the first *provincial council* at Oscott in 1852, with a view to give to his province a thoroughly ecclesiastical organization. Two others were subsequently held by him at the same place. His numerous lectures, delivered before large and cultivated audiences, on almost every variety of subject—*On Religion and Science; On the Points of Contact between Science and Art;*[2] *On the Connection between the Arts of Design and those of Production; On the Influence of Words on Thought and Civilization; On the Ceremonies of Holy Week; On the Real Presence; On the Doctrines of the Church;* together with his essays and other writings, but particularly his *Fabiola, or a Church of the Catacombs*, that singularly truthful and vivid picture of the trials and persecutions of the Church in the early ages, gave him a reputation both at home and abroad of being one of the most finished and scholarly writers of his age. The *Callista* of Dr. Newman is a work similar in character to the Fabiola of Cardinal Wiseman, the author's aim being to give a picture of the Church in Africa during the latter days of the persecutions. These two works, the first of a new school, were shortly followed by others, illustrative of Catholic life in the different ages of the Church, and very effective in breaking down a host of prejudices against her institutions and the persons identified with her interests and history. Of the writers who gained distinction in this new

---

the Church in England. That such has not been the case, but that the reverse has taken place, is shown by Cardinal Manning by the following figures:

	Churches.	*Priests.*
1830	410	.....
1840	457	542
1850	587	788
1862	824	1215

—*Miscellanies*, p. 42. (Tr.)

[1] Four Lectures on Concordats, Germ., Cologne, 1856.

[2] Germ. by *Reusch*, Cologne, 1863.

Hosted by Google

field, *Spencer Northcote* (*The Roman Catacombs*), *Macguire* (*Rome and its Ruler*), and *Lady Fullerton*, deserve mention.[1]

Father *Faber*,[2] formerly Superior of the Oratory in London, and his Brothers of the Oratory, together with some laymen, whom they associated with themselves in the work, edited and published a series of ascetical writings, which were well received, and did a great deal of good in other countries as well as in England († 1863). In a magnificent speech, made at the Second Congress of Malines, Cardinal Wiseman spoke with gratitude and exultation of the progress of the *Catholic Church in England*, the result of the combined labors of men who were single-minded and in earnest in their work. The whole life of the great Cardinal was a verification of the words uttered by him on his death-bed. "*I have always*," said he, "*allowed others to do as much good as they would; I have never stood in the way of any one; and God has blessed my manner of acting.*" He referred here to the *Tablet*, a weekly newspaper, the first number of which appeared May 16, 1840. It was edited for fifteen years by Mr. *Frederic Lucas*, a convert from Quakerism, and one of the most accomplished and scholarly writers of England. The tone of the paper was then, and has continued to be so since, independent, though thoroughly loyal to the Church and the Holy See. It permits in its columns the discussion of all questions on which a difference of opinion is allowed by the Church, never excluding papers because it discovers in their authors' argument a divergence from its own line of thought. It pursued a middle course between the *Dublin Review*, edited by *Dr. Ward*, and the *Home and Foreign Review*, edited by *Lord Acton*, the former

[1] Cf. Collection of the Classical Works of Modern Literature in England; Germ. translation, published at Cologne by Bachem.

[2] His published writings after his conversion are as follows: "Catholic Hymns" and an "Essay on Beatification and Canonization" (1848); "The Spirit and Genius of St. Philip Neri" (1850); "Catholic Home Missions" (1851); "All for Jesus" (1854); "Growth in Holiness" (1856); "The Blessed Sacrament" (1856); "The Creator and the Creature" (1857); "The Foot of the Cross, or the Sorrows of Mary;" "Spiritual Conferences" (1859); "Bethlehem;" "The Precious Blood," etc. A complete edition of his ascetical works has been republished (partly from advance sheets) by John Murphy & Co., Baltimore. See Bowden's "Life of F. W. Faber," 1869. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

of Ultramontane and the latter of liberal tendencies. There are also two other weekly newspapers of high merit published in London, viz: *The Weekly Register* and the *Westminster Gazette*, the latter started in the beginning of 1867. Like the *Tablet*, while giving all needful attention to the current topics of the day, they are chiefly remarkable for the ability with which the relations of Church and State are discussed in their columns; for their discriminating reviews and notices of new books; for their foreign correspondence; and for their temperate and thorough treatment of political and social questions. One of the ablest periodicals of any denomination in England is the *Month and Catholic Review*, conducted by the Jesuits.

By the death of Cardinal Wiseman, which occurred February 15, 1865, the Church lost one of the most active, learned, and worthy bishops of this century. To an elegant and classic taste he united deep and varied learning, embracing in its range theology and the natural sciences, canon law, history, and archaeology. He was, moreover, distinguished for great prudence, for gracious manners and easy address, for dignity and firmness of character, and for those other virtues characteristic of a prelate and prince of the Church.

The late *Ritualistic* movement, led by Dr. Pusey, and, like the Tractarian Movement, having its center of operations at Oxford, has inspired a hope that through its influence many may be led into the Catholic Church. The advocates of Ritualism claim that under the actual circumstances, if the religious and social condition of the people is to be improved, the rites, the ceremonies, vestments, and institutions of the primitive Church, which the Protestants of the sixteenth century set aside, must be again adopted. Since the publication by Dr. Pusey of his *Eirenicon*, the tentative efforts to conform the Anglican Ritual to that of the old Church have been still more marked and frequent.[1] Dr. Pusey and the Rev. *Mr. Humble* have both strenuously insisted on *penance* as a true Sacrament, implying the obligation of *auricular confession* of

[1] Cf. The Present State of the Movement in the Anglican High Church toward Catholicity, with Important Documents, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1867.

Hosted by Google

sins in detail; and while the latter affirms that this Sacrament is the only adequate preventative of infanticide, the former declares that it is a most efficacious means of drawing youth off from vices peculiar to that season of life and making them better members of society. The Ritualists are also ardent advocates of *monastic life.* "The foundations of the entire structure of the Missions of the Roman Catholic Church," says *Dr. Mackenzie Wallcot,* "have been laid by members of *Religious Orders,* who practice self-denial in an heroic degree. In our system everything is left in the hands of the secular clergy, and its utter failure proves conclusively that it needs to be organized anew. The conversion of the whole of Europe by the Monastic Orders shows what can be done by the combined efforts of men united by the most sacred ties." These sentiments were also shared by *Dr. Meadow,* who warmly advocated the policy of placing the hospitals and workhouses in charge of religious communities of women.

Cardinal *Manning,* Cardinal Wiseman's successor in the see of Westminster, has labored zealously to turn to the best account this movement toward the Catholic Church. He is an ornament to the Church, and one of the most able, hard working, and exemplary of living prelates. Like his predecessor, he is possessed of fine mental endowments, and is an accurate scholar, a deep thinker, and a vigorous and graceful writer; and like him, too, he has fairly compelled the admiration of his countrymen by his honest, manly, and outspoken course. His writings are numerous, the most important being *The Glories of the Sacred Heart, The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost, The Temporal Power of the Pope, The Independence of the Holy See, Sin and its Consequences, The Love of Jesus to Penitents, Petri Privilegium, The Fourfold Sovereignty of God* (2 vols.), *The Four Great evils of the Day, Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects* (3 vols.), *The True Story of the Vatican Council,* besides essays, reviews, addresses, and controversial papers, some of which have been recently published in a volume of *Miscellanies.*

Hosted by Google

IRELAND.

Jacob Neher, Eccl. Geography, 3 vols., Ratisbon, 1865–1868. *Flor. Riess*, S. J., The Modern State and Christian Schools, Freiburg, 1868. *Catholic World*, June, 1869.

According to the statistics given in the *Catholic Almanac* for 1878 (p. 96), there are in Ireland 4 archbishops, 24 bishops,[1] 1,004 priests, 1,721 administrators, curates, chaplains, professors, etc., in colleges and schools; 444 regulars; or a total of 3,172 priests; or including bishops, private chaplains, etc., 3,450. They are a zealous, hard-working, and exemplary body, and are wholly supported by the voluntary, but generous contributions of the faithful.[2] A taste for learning is kept alive and encouraged among them by theological conferences, held in each diocese four times a year. As a rule, the several bishops preside in person over these conferences, and by their presence and wise supervision stimulate the clergy to pursue their studies with greater zeal and regularity. There are in each diocese, besides a vicar-general, titular canons, and as early as 1862 there were in Ireland nine chapters canonically established. In filling a vacant see, which, during the interval, is administered by a vicar-capitular, the parish-priests of the diocese in which the vacancy occurs send on three names to the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith at Rome, one of which is, with rare exceptions, selected and approved by the Pope. The Cardinal Protector of the Irish Church, resident in Rome, names the Deans of Chapters; the bishops of the country appoint to all other preferments.

If Ireland is not to-day Protestant in religion, it is certainly not because numerous and gigantic efforts have not been made to induce the people to apostatize from the faith of their fathers. Perhaps the most potent, as well as the most plausible and insidious of these, was the establishment of the System of *National Schools*. Even men usually clear-headed and sagacious in judging of questions and measures affecting the interests of the Catholics of Ireland seemed to have been deceived as to the real character of the National Schools. That the National Schools were really designed to subvert the faith of the Catholic people of Ireland is evident from the words of Dr. Whately, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, who was one of the first Commissioners appointed to serve on the National Board. "The education," said he "supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church."[3] And to show that this was precisely what he intended the schools to do, and that stealthily and insidiously, he went on to say: "I be-

[1] Exclusive of two bishops with no local jurisdiction in Ireland.

[2] *The Freeman's Journal Church Commission* gave the following statistics as to the revenue of the Catholic Church in Ireland in 1868:

Income of the Bishops and the Parochial Clergy	£340,480
Regular Clergy	55 000
Maintenance, Repairs, and Extensions of Churches	116,050
Hospitals, Orphanages, Asylums, Colleges, Seminaries, Schools, etc.	250,000
Total	£762,030

[3] *Life of Dr. Whately*, p. 244. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

lieve, as I said the other day, that *mixed education* is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I can not venture openly to profess this opinion. I can not openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battles with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me."[1] The history of the National Schools is an illustration of how Catholics may innocently commit themselves to measures, apparently the most beneficial, and in reality the most perilous. It was shown by testimony laid before Parliament in the year 1825 that the instruction given in Ireland was miserably insufficient, and objectionable on other grounds. It was therefore proposed to establish a National System of Education, which should be acceptable to persons of all religious professions. The plan was submitted in 1826 to the Roman Catholic bishops, who refused to give it their approval unless the faith of the Roman Catholic children were fully protected. As a guarantee of this they required that Catholic teachers should be appointed in all schools in which the Catholic children were in the majority; that in schools in which they were in a minority a Catholic assistant should be employed; that Catholic masters and mistresses should themselves have been educated in Catholic schools; and that the school-books used should be approved by the Catholic prelates.[2] In 1828 the Committee of the House of Commons expressed themselves in favor of non sectarian education in Ireland, and in 1831 Mr. Stanley, afterwards Lord Derby, in a letter written to the Duke of Leinster, stated that the government was about to create a Board, of which his Grace was to be President, to superintend a system of National Education. In this letter Mr. Stanley drew out the main features of the System. He stated that the Board must not permit the reading of Scripture by all classes of pupils; that the clergy of all denominations were to be treated with perfect equality; and that they were to be free to give religious instruction to the children of their respective creeds. This letter, when made public, roused the indignation of Protestants of all shades of opinion. At a public meeting, held in the Rotunda of Dublin in 1832, they protested against the exclusion of the Bible from the schools, and the Anglican bishops cried out with equal energy against having the superintendence of National Education taken out of their hands and vested in a Board composed of men of various and conflicting religious opinions. They soon, however, became not only reconciled to the system, but its most ardent admirers and energetic supporters. The leading denominations of Ireland had representatives on the Board. Archbishop Murray, of Dublin, represented the Catholics; Dr. Whately, the Anglicans; and Rev. James Carlisle, the Presbyterians. As years went on the number of Commissioners increased, until it finally reached twenty, half of whom were Catholics and half Protestants.

In 1850 Dr. *Cullen* was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, and shortly after a bull was published convoking a *National Synod*, to meet at *Thurles*. This was one of the most important events of this century in the history of the

[1] *Life of Dr. Whately*, p. 246. (TR.)

[2] See Pastoral Address of the Archbishops and Bishops to the Clergy and Laity of Ireland, 1826. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Church in Ireland. Its decrees are numerous and important, and refer chiefly to the manners of the clergy, to ecclesiastical discipline and worship, and the administration of the Sacraments, insisting particularly on the correction of abuses and the restoration of such needful and laudable observances as had fallen into disuse.[1] The bishops disapproved, without directly condemning, the National Schools; and demanded that all books used in them, containing anything contrary to Catholic teaching, should be thrown out, and that books used in schools frequented by Catholic children should have the approval of the bishops.[2] The Queen's Colleges, opened for the entrance of students in 1849, were conducted on precisely the same principles as the National Schools. At the instance of *John McHale*, Archbishop of Tuam, who has been since 1825 the determined foe of mixed education and the consistent advocate of separate schools, these colleges had been condemned by Rome, October 18, 1848.[3] They were again condemned in unqualified terms by the Synod of Thurles. It was declared improper for bishops to take any part in their management, and priests were forbidden to have any connection with them, either as Professors or Deans of Residences. Catholic young men were warned not to enter them, on account of the danger to which their faith and morals would be exposed.[4] In the meantime it was left to the discretion of the bishops to act as might seem best in regard to the National Schools.

Finally, at a meeting of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, at Maynooth College, on the 18th of August, 1869, presided over by Archbishop Cullen, who had been transferred to Dublin on the death of Archbishop Murray, in 1852, the system of mixed education, whether *primary*, *intermediate*, or *university*, was condemned "as grievously and intrinsically dangerous to the faith and morals of Catholic youth."[5] At the request of the Bishops of Ireland, this condemnation was confirmed by Rome in the same year.[6] The bishops, long desirous of having a place of Higher Education, where Catholic young men might go without peril to their faith and morals, at length, on the 3d of November, 1854, opened a *Catholic University* in Dublin. They have sent memorials to government, representing that Catholics can not be said to possess religious equality as long as they do not enjoy the same rights and privileges as their Protestant fellow-countrymen in the matter of education, and therefore

[1] *Decreta Synodi Plenariae Episcop. Hiberniae apud Thurles*, Dublin, 1851. (TR.)

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 56 sq. (TR.)

[3] The bill creating these Colleges was introduced May 9, 1845. (TR.)

[4] *Decreta Synodi Plen.*, etc., pp. 59 sq. (TR.)

[5] Pastoral Address of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, Dublin, 1871. (TR.)

[6] The injustice of the system of National Schools in Ireland may be seen from the following statistics:

"1. There are 2,454 schools, containing 373,756 Catholic children, with not a Protestant child."

"2. There are 2,483 schools, having 321,641 Catholic children, with only 24,381 Protestant children."

"That is, in 4,937—nearly 5,000—schools, with 695,397 Catholic children, there are no more than 24,381 Protestant." Card. *Manning*, Miscellanies, Letter to Earl Grey, 1868. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

asking that a charter, authorizing the conferring of degrees in the secular branches, be granted to the Catholic University, and a suitable endowment be provided for its support, or that some other arrangement be made by which Catholics may participate in university privileges without compromising their consciences.[1] Up to the present moment, the goverment has not shown the least disposition to satisfy these just demands, and the bishops have been obliged to shift as best they can. Thanks to the noble generosity of the Catholics of Ireland and the assistance received from their brethren in other lands, the Catholic University of Dublin, in spite of the injustice of government in withholding a charter, is in a comparatively flourishing condition.[2]

Besides the College of Maynooth and the Missionary College of All Hallows, there are thirteen other excellent ecclesiastical seminaries in Ireland.[3]

By the disestablishment and disendowment of the English Church in Ireland, through the *Irish Church Act* of 1869, one of the most stupendous grievances with which a people was ever afflicted was removed. This act was justly characterized by Mr. *Gladstone*, its author, as "the most grave and arduous work of legislation that had ever been laid before the House of Commons," and was one of the boldest and most thorough attempts that had yet been made to partially correct the accumulated wrongs and wicked legislation of three centuries. Not only had the Irish people been despoiled of their churches, abbeys, and convents, and of their ecclesiastical and charitable institutions; but, in addition to all this, they were forced to pay out of their poverty and hard earnings for the support of an alien Church and a detested clergy.

The capitalized value of the ecclesiastical property of Ireland and the additional annual revenue, literally stolen from the Catholic people of that country, represented in money, even after it had been reduced, in the words of Mr. Gladstone, "by the almost unbounded waste of life-tenants and the wisdom or un-wisdom of well-intentioned parliaments," the sum of £16,000,000, in the year 1868. After a protracted and exciting debate, the bill to disestablish and disendow the Irish Establishment passed both Houses of Parliament, and received the royal assent July 26, 1869. It provided that on the 1st day of January, 1871, the Established Church should cease to exist in Ireland, and its archbishops and bishops be disqualified to sit in Parliament; that churches in actual use should be handed over to the representatives of the several congregations, who were technically designated "governing bodies;" that all other properties, interests, etc., should be taken possession of by a Commission, and disposed of or reconveyed after January 1, 1871, as the act directed; that archbishops, bishops, and others holding benefices or preferments in the Irish Establishment should receive an annuity equal in amount to their ordinary incomes during the term of their natural lives, or while they continued to perform the duties of their several ecclesiastical offices; that the *regium donum* of the Presbyterians should be withdrawn, and that, in addition to a grant of a sum, equal to seventy-five thousand dollars, to their College at Belfast, they should receive in

[1] See Resolutions of the Bishops assembled at Maynooth College, August 18, 1869. (TR.)

[2] According to the *Fifth Report of the Royal Commission*, pp. 25, 26, the sum collected in 1874 was £187,000. (TR.)

[3] *Freeman's Journal Church Commission*, p. 385. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

compensation the annual interest on a sum equal to about four millions of dollars; and that the grant to Maynooth College should also be withdrawn, and the interest of a sum equal to less than half that set aside for the Presbyterians be appropriated for the support of that institution. The bill is very lengthy and very detailed, but these are its chief provisions.[1]

The Irish are literally a missionary people, and their influence in carrying the faith to other lands and perpetuating it there can only be properly appreciated by a reference to the statistics of emigration, which was at full tide in 1840. From 1845 to 1854, inclusive, 1,512,100 souls left the country, chiefly for America and Australia; from 1853 to 1860 the average number of immigrants annually to the United States was 71,856, and during the ten following years 69,084; in 1871 it was 65,591; in 1874, 48,136; in 1875, 31,433; and in 1876 only 16,432. The total number of Irish immigrants to the United States for the last thirty years is about two millions. As the great bulk of these settled in the larger cities, their influence upon the growth of Catholicity and the formation of public opinion in regard to the Church can hardly be overestimated.

Numerous important works have been published within the last forty years by eminent Irish scholars, whose names are known wherever the English language is spoken, and many of their theological writings are of great value. There is hardly a considerable town in the whole Island that has not a newspaper Catholic in tone and doing good service in the interest of the Church. There are also some periodicals of merit, of which it will be sufficient to mention the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, a monthly journal, conducted by a society of clergymen, under the sanction of Cardinal Cullen; *The Irish Monthly;* and the *Carlow College Magazine.*

SCOTLAND.

Lord Clarendon said in 1660 that the religion of Scotland consisted in an "abhorrence of Popery." The religious history of that country from the date of the Reformation down to very recent times has been a verification of this utterance. As late as the year 1700, a priest coming into the country was liable to the penalty of death, and scarcely any mitigation of this hostile legislation in regard to Catholics took place until the close of the eighteenth century. Still missionaries were not deterred from coming into the country from fear of barbarous enactments. An apostolic vicariate was erected there in 1695 by Innocent XII. and another by Clement XII. In the year 1800 there were in all Scotland only 15,000 Catholics; by 1850 this number had swelled to 200,000, and by 1864 to 400,000. In 1800 there was not a single priest registered in Scotland; in 1810 there were 21; in 1848, 100; in 1864, 178; in 1873, 225; and, at present, 1878, 260.

In the year 1800 there was not a Catholic church in the country; in 1810 there was only one; in 1850 there were 93; in 1873, 222; and in 1878, 236. In 1850 Scotland possessed 70 Catholic schools, and in 1864, 13 convents of females.

By the bull *Quanta laetitia affecti simus*, of February 13, 1827, Leo XII. divided the country into three Districts or Apostolic Vicariates, the Eastern, Western, and Northern. As has been stated in a preceding paragraph, there is a seminary at Blairs, on the right bank of the Dee, approved by the Propa-

[1] See *The Catholic World* for May, 1869.

Hosted by Google

ganda in 1832, and another, under the patronage of St. Felix, at Giffordhall, both in the Eastern District. On the occasion of the golden jubilee of the consecration of Pius IX. as bishop, the Vicars Apostolic of Scotland asked for the restoration of the hierarchy to that country, and received a promise that their request would be granted as soon as the condition of the Church there would warrant the measure. The papers relative to the subject were printed, and on the 19th of January, 1878, delivered to Cardinal Franchi for distribution to the Cardinals of the Congregation of the Propaganda for action at their meeting to be held on the 28th of the same month.[1] On the 29th, or the day after the meeting of the Cardinals, Pope Pius IX. († February 7, 1878) restored the hierarchy to Scotland. *St. Andrews* and *Glasgow* were made archiepiscopal sees; and the four sees of *Aberdeen*, *Galloway* (with seat at Dumfries), *Dunkeld* (with seat at Perth), and *Argyll* and the Isles (with seat at Oban), were made suffragan to St. Andrews.[2]

§ 418. *In Germany and Switzerland.*

†*Beda Weber*, Pen-pictures of the Life of the Church in Germany, Mentz, 1858.

After the Treaty of Westphalia, Protestants gained the ascendancy in Germany, and their newly-acquired power was used to oppress the Church. A spirit of religious indifferentism began to spread among the people, which the evil influence of Rationalism, the natural ally of Protestantism, did much to strengthen and perpetuate. The terrible and disastrous *effects that followed the French Revolution* were still felt. The Church was spoiled of her possessions; her external organization was shattered by the suppression of bishopries, chapters, and convents; and she was no longer permitted to govern herself. This state of affairs was slightly, but only slightly, improved by the Concordats entered into with the Holy See. (See § 396.) The Catholics of Germany began to lose heart; they no longer dared to speak out and demand their rights. There was also a blight upon their intellectual life; scientific and theological works from their pens became daily more rare, until finally they ceased almost entirely to appear.

The following causes contributed to rouse them from this state of lethargy, to attach them more warmly to the Church, and, in consequence, to make them more active and zealous in her defense:

I. At the opening of the nineteenth century, a number of

[1] *London Tablet* of January 26, 1878. (Tr.)

[2] *Liverpool Times*, February 1, 1878. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

illustrious converts came into the Church. The first of these was *Count Frederic Leopold von Stolberg*, who was shortly followed by *Frederic Schlegel*, *Charles Louis Haller*, *Adam Müller*, *Beckedorf*, *Jarke*, *Phillips*, the two *Möllers*, *Herbst*, the laborious *Louis Clarus* (Völk), *Hurter*, *Gfrörer*, *Ida Hahn*, *Daumer*, *Lämmer*, *Krafft*, *Baumstark*, and many others.[1] Ardently devoted to the Church, and loving her with an enthusiastic love, these Catholic champions set themselves to the work of defending her doctrines and portraying to the world her manifold beauties.

II. The outrageous abuse and the vile calumnies heaped upon Count Stolberg and other converts to Catholicity; the celebration, between the years 1817 and 1846, of *jubilees*, commemorating the third centenary of the introduction *of Protestantism* into various countries; and the malignant hatred against the Church displayed by Protestants on these occasions, their wanton outrage of the feelings of Catholics, and their extravagant honors to the memory of Luther,[2] revived the dormant spirit of faith among the sons of the Church, and taught them that if they would be helped they must help themselves. First of all, it was necessary to set themselves right before the public, to defend Catholic doctrine, to correct misrepresentation, to brand calumnies as they deserved, and for this purpose they started the excellent periodicals, *The Catholic of Mentz* and *The Theological Quarterly of Tübingen*. Again, they began to make *historical research* a serious study, pursuing their labors with greater zeal and profit as days went on, thereby exposing and dissipating a cloud of falsehoods and misrepresentations in writers of both ecclesiastical and civil history, which, as *de Maistre* truthfully remarked, has been for the last three hundred years "a conspiracy against the truth." The Catholics of Germany appreciated the fact that if they would put the truth clearly before the minds of their countrymen, set forth the nature, the characteristics, and the dignity of the Church, and facilitate the return of their

[1] *Rosenthal*, Life Pictures of Converts in the Nineteenth Century, Schaffhausen, 1865 sq., 3 vols., with Supplement.

[2] *Constantine Christ* (nom de plume), Examination of the Sermons of Living Reformers, in Relation to Tolerance in the Nineteenth Century, Ratisbon, 1845.

Hosted by Google

separated brethren to her fold, they must retake the ground they had lost in the field of history, and this they proceeded to do, and did triumphantly. No man of Germany probably exercised a more decisive influence in this movement than the gifted *Joseph von Görres;* and it is a significant fact that it was precisely a calm and judicial study of the history of the Church in the Middle Ages that led men like *Hurter* and *Gfrörer* to profess her teachings, and made *John Frederic Böhmer*, of Frankfort, one of the most profound historical students of this century, whose delight it was to be styled an "*Apologist of the Church*," the head of a numerous school of Catholic historians, with whom the study of the Middle Ages was a specialty.[1]

III. The "*Symbolism*" of *Möhler*, contrasting the dogmatic differences between Catholics and Protestants, as set forth in the Confessions of each, appeared immediately after the centenary jubilee, commemorating the Diet and the Confession of Augsburg, and produced upon the public mind a sensation similar to that of a clap of thunder in a clear sky. The doctrines of the Catholic Church and those of Lutheranism and the Reformed Church are here set side by side in so striking, luminous, and masterly a way, that Protestant theologians, who had heretofore pursued the policy of superciliously ignoring the writings of Catholics, feeling they could do so no longer with safety, now published many criticisms of the work, and made it the text of lectures in their universities, doing their best, but in vain, to refute it. The Universities of Tübingen and Munich, with both of which this great writer was

[1] Of the disciples of Böhmer, it will be sufficient to name Aschbach, Ficker, Höfler, Janssen, Junkmann, Stumpf, and Will. The historians, *Chmel* and *Kopp*, the former an Austrian and the latter a Swiss, and Lütolf, of Lucerne, took pride in calling him their master and imitating him as their model. *Potthast*, of Berlin, followed Böhmer's method of using sources. Of the Catholics who have written on *modern* history, the following have gained the greatest name: Cornelius, Kampschulte, Gindely, Koch, Jörg, Holzwarth, Hüffer, and *Onno Klopp*, the last named being thoroughly Catholic in tone. The statesmen, *Alfred von Reumont* and *Baron von Hübner*, have given to their historical works all the grace and elegance of artistic finish. Cf. *Janssen*. The Life, Letters, and Occasional Writings of *J. Fr. Böhmer*, Freiburg, 1868.

Hosted by Google

connected, may be justly proud of his fame, which has added not a little to their own. On his tomb is inscribed the epitaph: "*The Defender of the Faith, the Ornament of Letters, the Comfort of the Church,*" which will tell to future generations the work done by this great man for Catholicity, particularly in Germany.

IV. This work, together with what is known as the *Catastrophe*, or, more properly, the *Event of Cologne*,[1] produced a wide and profound impression in Germany. It was at this time that the *Historico-political Papers* began to be issued. It was at this time, too, that *Joseph von Görres* pleaded the cause of the Church, her authority, and her greatness, so manfully, eloquently, and triumphantly, in his *Athanasius* and the *Trinarians*, that now, as formerly, by his powerful protests in the *Rhenish Mercury* against the despotism of Napoleon in Germany, he merited the title of "*The Fifth Great Power.*" His dying words, "*The State rules, the Church protests,*" contained a prophecy that has been verified by events.[2]

V. To her surprise and against her will, the Church was at this time aided in her conflict against despotism by the sect of the *Rongeanists*, or, as they preferred to call themselves, *German Catholics.* We shall have occasion to speak again of this sect in a subsequent paragraph.[3]

VI. *The memorable events of the year* 1848 contributed not a little to improve the condition of the Church in Germany. The Revolution that had its origin in France swept over nearly every country of Europe, and the German sovereigns found themselves forced to grant to their subjects the rights and the freedom that had been so long withheld. This convulsion, though *political* in its origin and essence, was not without its influence upon the Church. But while the thrones of princes were tottering and falling to the ground, the fabric of the Church, strong in the strength of a divine organization, bore up under the shock, and now, as when the Roman Empire was going to pieces, stood firm and erect amid sur-

[1] See p. 766 sq.

[2] *Jos. Görres*, Complete Works, edited by Mary von Görres, Munich, 1854–1858.

[3] See § 421.

Hosted by Google

rounding desolation and ruin. Now, as then, it was plain, she contained within herself an imperishable *principle of indefectibility*. To the bishops the present seemed a favorable opportunity to demand for the Church the restoration of those rights, without which it was impossible for her to carry out her high mission. Accordingly, at the invitation of *John von Geissel*, Archbishop of Cologne, *the bishops of Germany met at Würzburg*, and continued in session from the 21st of October to the 16th of November, taking counsel as to the best means of raising the Church from the depth into which she had fallen. The following were the results of their long and arduous labors: 1. They addressed a very able and affectional *pastoral letter to the Catholics of Germany*; 2. They sent a most pressing and cheering *exhortation to the clergy;* 3. They drew up a *memorial to the German sovereigns*, which the bishops of the respective governments were charged to communicate officially to the proper authorities. In this they said:

"The Bishops of Germany *do not desire a separation of Church and State;* they ask only for the fuller liberty and more complete independence of the Church. As to those who differ from them in belief, they will always exhibit that charity, forbearance, and justice so necessary to the peace and well-being of citizens of whatever profession of faith they may be, without, however, giving any countenance to indifferentism, so destructive of every form of religion. *Having received a divine commission to teach*, they demand the fullest freedom in the matter of education and instruction, including the right of founding and governing their own institutions of learning, of directing their own schools, of administering their own school-funds, of selecting the text-books of religion, of watching over the religious instruction of both the primary and higher schools, and of having the exclusive management of their own seminaries. They declare the interference of the State *in the examination of candidates for admission into clerical seminaries*, and in the competitive trials of priests for parochial appointments, an unwarrantable infringement on the liberty of the Church and the rights of bishops, who alone are competent to judge of the learning and moral character of those desiring to become ministers of the Church. It is a part of the Church's office *to minister to the temporal*, as well as to the spiritual well-being of nations, and to discharge this duty she must be in possession of the necessary freedom. But, above and beyond all, the bishops demand the right, which is theirs by every title, of controlling all matters of *public worship*, and, hence, *of forming religious associations and founding convents*. They further claim *the right of administering all ecclesiastical property;* they protest most solemnly against the injurious imputation that *their relations to the See of Rome* constitute a crime against German nationality, and are dangerous to the State; they denounce as un-German the practice of setting spies

Hosted by Google

to observe what goes on in the intercourse between pastors and their flocks; and, finally, they express their unalterable devotion and attachment to the Head of the Church, the Center and Pledge of Catholic unity, and declare a *placetum regium*, of whatever character, a violation of the Church's imprescriptible rights, and wholly incompatible with the enjoyment of complete freedom."

On their return to their dioceses, the bishops did their best to carry out the measures to which they had pledged themselves. Those of Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine agreed among themselves to draw up separate memorials, to be presented to their several governments.

The complaints of the bishops obtained a respectful hearing, and, in *Prussia*, the XIIth, XIIIth, and XVth Articles of the new Constitution embodied the substance of their demands. Article XII. provides that "the Catholic Church, the Evangelical, and all other religious societies, shall direct and administer their own affairs, and that they shall possess and control all houses, foundations, and properties set apart for purposes of worship, education, and charity." By Article XIII., religious associations were permitted to communicate freely with their superiors, and to publish all ordinances, without any restriction, other than what was imposed upon publications of any other character. By Article XV., the State cedes the right, hitherto claimed, of nominating and appointing to church-livings, except in cases of patronage, or where special provision is made to the contrary.

In *Austria*, also, the bishops obtained a hearing, and their voice was potent to rouse the Catholics of that country from their lethargy to a zeal and activity that carried the memories of the people back to the days of *Frederic Schlegel* and *Bishop Frint*. After having put down the revolutionary demonstrations of his subjects in the German and Italian provinces and in Hungary, the *Emperor Francis Joseph*, on the 18th of April, 1850, granted, provisionally, until some more satisfactory arrangements could be made, the demands made by the bishops who had met at Vienna on the 15th of July of the preceding year. These were, in substance, that the imperial *placet* should be given up; that the bishops should be permitted to

Hosted by Google

communicate freely with the Holy See; and that in all matters pertaining to public worship and ecclesiastical discipline they should enjoy the most ample freedom. A *Concordat* was concluded between Austria and the Holy See, August 18, 1855, by which the relations of Church and State were definitely established, the Emperor renouncing the principles of Josephism, by which the Church had been so long held in bondage. To the bishops who went to thank him for his spirit of fairness to the Church, the Emperor remarked: "My wish is to secure the temporal welfare of my subjects, and *not to stand in the way of their eternal salvation.* To this end all my efforts are directed." Notwithstanding that the Emperor granted, purely of his own good will, more extensive liberties to the Protestant subjects of his Empire than their brethren enjoyed, even in any Protestant State of Germany at that time, this did not prevent the enemies of the Church, both in Austria and other countries of Europe, from crying out and clamoring against the Concordat, as they had done on a former occasion in the cases of Würtemberg and Baden; and now, as then, they labored most strenuously to prevent its execution, and, if possible, to suppress it altogether. For a dozen years after it had been concluded, few, if any, of its provisions were carried into effect; and, strange to say, the first time a really practical effort was made in this direction, it was in regard to the order to be observed in cemeteries in which Catholics and Protestants were alike buried. To allow the controversy to be narrowed down to an issue concerning the dead, while so many questions of vital importance to the living were still unsettled, showed a lack of judgment and tact somewhere. The enemies of the Church still continued to clamor against the Concordat, asserting that its provisions were detrimental to the relations, whether civil or religious, which should exist between Catholics and non-Catholics. So persistent and determined was this hostility, and so plausible the arguments by which it was sustained, that many really well-meaning Catholics began to express a wish that the Concordat had never been concluded, and were now quite willing to see it either revoked or annulled. When it was finally abolished, August 9, 1870, the event gave greater surprise and

Hosted by Google

pain to the Holy Father than under other circumstances it would have done, from the fact that the moment was one of exceptional gravity and peril to the Holy See. As early as 1868, three laws, highly prejudicial to the interests of the Church, were laid by the government before the States General, and passed by that body. Of these the first referred to *civil marriage*, the second to *undenominational schools*, and the third to the relations of citizens of *all religious creeds* to each other.

ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF THE UPPER RHINE. (Cf. § 409.)

The conflict between the Church and the Civil authority in this Province was more bitter and protracted than in any other part of Germany. When, in 1848, the policy pursued by governments in regard to Church and State began to produce its baneful and legitimate results, particularly in Baden, *Vicari*, Archbishop of Freiburg, judged that the moment had arrived for demanding[1] for the Church the restoration of those rights which had been so long and so persistently withheld, and, above all, of the right of governing herself, without the interference of the civil authority. There were many reasons why at least the Catholic Church in Baden should enjoy full freedom and be the equal of any other before the law. Prussia, then the most considerable Protestant State of Germany, had recently granted more extensive rights and larger liberty to the Church; everything in the German States seemed to indicate a tendency toward uniformity, whether in legislation, in weights and measures, or in coin and taxation; and, finally, the *bulk* of the population of Baden was *Catholic*. The men at the head of the government failed to appreciate these reasons, or, if appreciating them, declined to act upon them. In 1851, the archbishop and bishops of the other States of the Province of the Upper Rhine drew up a memorial, petitioning their governments for the same rights that had been demanded by Archbishop Vicari. In consequence, the civil representatives of the several States constituting this Ecclesiastical Province came together for consultation at Carlsruhe. In the meantime the *Grand Duke Leopold* died (April 24, 1852), and his death was the occasion of still further widening the breach between the government of Baden and Archbishop Vicari. On former occasions, some of the ecclesiastical authorities, for whom a violation of conscience had fewer terrors than the thought of giving displeasure to civil governments, had consented to say solemn *Masses of requiem* on the death of Protestant princes. A Mass of this character was now demanded for Duke Leopold. Archbishop Vicari respectfully, but firmly, refused either to say it himself or to permit another to do so; first, because he was convinced that Masses should not be offered for persons, who, like Protestants, do not even believe in their efficacy; and next, because an order of the Pope had been

[1] March 21, 1848.

Hosted by Google

lately published in Bavaria, forbidding the saying of such Masses.[1] He, however, ordered other appropriate funeral services for the illustrious Duke, in whose death he had lost a munificent benefactor. With these the government was not content. It insisted upon having a solemn *Mass of requiem*, and promised its protection to such priests as would say it in defiance of the archbishop's order. Some were found base enough to comply, and received the usual reward of men who break faith with their ecclesiastical superiors to secure the favor of the world. When these priests were threatened with punishment the government *declined* to interfere; but they were let off with the very light penalty of making a spiritual retreat, at St. Peter's Seminary, which was conducted by Father *Roh*, S. J. After waiting in vain for some definite action on the part of the civil authorities, Herman,[2] the *metropolitan*, in February, 1853, summoned the bishops of the suffragan sees of Mentz, Rottenburg, Limburg, and Fulda to meet him in conference at Freiburg. They resolved to send memorials to their respective governments to the effect that they would again, at an early day, set forth their claims and the reasons by which they were supported, and thenceforth act as if they had been granted. Their demands, embodied in a Memorial, dated March 5, 1853, were denied by the governments, and they accordingly met again at Freiburg, and in a Memorial, dated June 18, 1853, after reiterating whatever they had previously said, they added that they could not believe there was any serious intention of doing such extraordinary violence to their consciences, simply because they made certain claims for the Church, which were thought incompatible with the rights of the State, but which, by ordinance of God, are essential to the freedom of ecclesiastical government. They went on to say that these claims had been formerly so completely conceded in Germany that no one thought of questioning them; that they were provided for in the bulls *Provida solersque* and *Ad Dominici gregis custodiam*, containing the stipulations entered into with the Holy See; and that the Church in the Electorate of Hesse, one of the States of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine, was at that moment in the enjoyment of nearly all of them.

The bishops claimed the right of full control over the education and appointment of their clergy and the administration of ecclesiastical discipline, whether in regard to priests or laymen; they also claimed the right to build and to possess Catholic schools; to found institutes and form associations, and do whatever else might be necessary to the maintenance and development of religious life; and, finally, to have the complete administration of the property guaranteed to the Church by the Treaty of Westphalia and the Commissioners of the German Empire.

---

[1] *Dereser*, a Catholic priest of Carlsruhe, had already raised similar objections on the occasion of the death of the Grand Duke *Charles Frederic*. His language was somewhat intemperate, and his imprudence was punished with exile. Cf. *Catholic Affairs* in Baden, Pt. I., pp. 23, 24; also *The Catholic* of 1828, No. 4; Athanasia, by *Benkert*, Würzburg, 1847, Vol. I., No. 1; *Döllinger*, Rights and Duties of the Church toward the Dead of other Denominations, Freiburg, 1852 (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, 1842).

[2] *Mast*, Dogmatical and Historical Treatise on the Legal Position of Archbishops, Freiburg, 1847.

Hosted by Google

The various governments declined to make any concessions other than those of March 3, 1853, and threatened to proceed against such persons as would go beyond them. Archbishop Herman continued to call upon the *High Consistory* (formerly the Catholic Ecclesiastical Department), either to concede the demands of the Memorial or to resign their positions, threatening them with excommunication in case of refusal. He also insisted that the competitive examinations for admission into ecclesiastical seminaries should be conducted *without the* presence of a *government commissioner*. The government of Baden appointed (November 7, 1853) *Burger*, Mayor of Freiburg, mandatory to the Crown, and required that all commands issuing from the archbishop should be submitted to his inspection, or otherwise be declared void; and that any of the clergy obeying the archbishop's instructions should be punished as common criminals. The archbishop in turn excommunicated both the members of the High Consistory and the Mandatary to the Crown, and published a Pastoral Letter, protesting against the encroachments of the civil authority upon his rights. Shortly after, he appointed to several vacant parishes, to which neither the government nor private individuals possessed the right of presentation. The government now began to carry out its threat of November, 1853, by arresting and imprisoning priests who yielded obedience to their archbishop, but as they were nearly all found to be guilty, the inconvenience arising from their apprehension in a body, and the possible danger of such a measure, were appreciated, and they were considerately let off with fines, bearing no proportion to the charges that were brought against them.

Pius IX. protested against the action of the government in two *allocutions*, the one dated December 19, 1853, and the other January 9, 1854; and the episcopate of Europe and America, diocesan societies and associations, and even individual distinguished laymen of name, sent letters and addresses expressing their sympathy with the archbishop and their admiration of his courage.

By new ordinances of April 18th and May 6th and 18th, the government still further encroached upon the rights of the Church in the *administration of ecclesiastical property*. Against these the archbishop protested, May 5, 1854, stating that, according to *Canon Law*, local ecclesiastical property should be administered by a board of trustees, sworn to conscientiously perform their duties. These events roused considerable indignation in the Catholic districts, and it was feared that some demonstration might be made against the government. To prevent this, large bodies of troops were brought together where danger was most apprehended, and the public discontent was considerably augmented by the prevailing scarcity of food. The archbishop was placed under arrest, and *criminal proceedings* were instituted against him on the ground that he had violated his oath of allegiance and fidelity to the laws of the country. From the 23d to the 30th of May his palace was guarded by soldiers, and during this interval the churches of his diocese wore an aspect of mourning. The bells ceased to ring, and the organs were hushed; the only sounds heard were the accents of prayer, as the faithful implored the divine aid for their courageous pastor. When he was again set at liberty the archbishop defended himself against the charges imputed to him, in a pastoral letter, which was read from all the pulpits of his diocese on the 3d of June, 1854. In this, the venerable old man, now eighty-two years of age, triumphantly vindicated his conduct,

Hosted by Google

and showed that, in a season of almost general defection, he had remained loyal to the State. In the meantime, the government sent Count *Leiningen*, and, some time later, *Brunner*, Counselor of State, to Rome, to open negotiations with the Holy See. The bishops of the Upper Rhine had declared in their Memorial that, in the case the government should succeed in adjusting the existing difficulties with the Holy Father, "they would cheerfully submit to the ordinances and instructions of Rome." After protracted and wearisome delays, the so-called *Preliminary Articles* were agreed upon at Rome on the 17th of June and the 7th of September. It was agreed that all legal proceedings against both the archbishop and his clergy should be withdrawn, and that Church property should be administered as it had been before the commencement of the controversy. The archbishop, on his part, consented to forego, for the time being, his contested rights, and content himself with the privilege of naming appointees to vacant parishes, under the title of *parish vicars*, to whom the government allowed the usual emoluments.

A *Convention* between Würtemberg and the Holy See was concluded July 22, 1857, and in publishing it the government honestly stated[1] "that it was only just to listen to the demands of the bishops representing the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine, *inasmuch as it was freely admitted that the condition of ecclesiastical affairs there was abnormal, and by no means in accord with the prescriptions of Canon Law.*" A *similar Convention* was concluded on the 28th of June, 1859, between the *Grand Duke of Baden* and *Pius IX.*[2]

[1] *Dr. Florian Riess, S. J.*, The Würtemberg Concordat, an Essay, Freiburg, 1858.

[2] The following are the titles of the acts and principal documents referring to this controversy: The Restoration of Canon Law in the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, by a German Statesman, Stuttg. 1853. Memorial of the Episcopate of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Fbg. 1853. Reply of the Archbp. of Freiburg to the Decree of the Grand Duchy of Baden, dated March 5, 1853, Fbg. 1853. Examination of the Resolutions adopted by the Governments of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine on the occasion of the Bishops' Memorial of March 5, 1853, Schaffhausen, 1853. The Rights of the Church, in connection with the Eccl. Controversy in Baden, with special reference to the Lawfulness of Excommunication, etc., Mentz, 1853. *Hirscher*, Hints in Aid of a Just View of the Present Eccl. Controversy, Fbg. 1854. *Lieber*, On the Affairs of the Eccl. Prov. of the Upper Rhine, Fbg., 1853. *Baron von Ketteler*, Bp. of Mentz, The Rights and Legal Guarantees of the Cath. Church in Germany, Mentz, 1854. (*Seitz*), The Legal Relations of the Cath. Bps. of Germany to the Governments of the German States, Mentz, 1854. *C. Bader*, An Exposition of the Controversy, based on Public Documents, in the "*German Quarterly*" of 1854, Nros. 65, 66, 68; and by the *same*, The Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Frbg. 1860. *Addresses* to the Most Rev. Archbishop Herman von Vicari, from Various Parts of the Catholic World, occasioned by the Eccl. Controversy in Baden, Mentz, 1854, 4 nros. The writings of his *adversaries* are given by *Warnkönig*, On the Conflict of the Episcopacy of the Prov. of the Upper Rhine with the Civil Government, Erlangen, 1853. Other Hints on the True Nature (auch zur Orientirung über) of the Present Eccl. Controversy,

Hosted by Google

These Conventions were of short duration. The Protestants met in *conference at Durlach*, and with the aid of some Liberal Catholics and a majority of the Professors of the University of Freiburg, created such an agitation that when the Convention of Baden came before the Chambers it was promptly rejected March 30, 1860. The Würtemberg Convention was similarly rejected March 16, 1861. Both the Pope and the archbishop protested against this flagrant violation of solemn engagements, but to no purpose; the governments and the chambers were equally determined to sustain their action. In Baden a more liberal law than had previously existed was passed for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, which, Minister Lamey said, embodied the substance of the Convention just annulled.[1] A law of a similar character, passed January 30, 1862, was substituted for the Convention by the government of Würtemberg. Bishop *von Ketteler*, who placed little reliance in the Conventions entered into with Rome by the governments of this Ecclesiastical Province, made a personal appeal to that of Hesse-Darmstadt in behalf of his own diocese of Mentz.[2] He secured moderately favorable terms, but like those agreed upon between Rome and Baden and Würtemberg, they met with opposition in the Upper Chamber, in 1866, and he was in consequence obliged to relinquish them, expressing the hope, however, that the government, while executing the existing laws, would exercise such wisdom and moderation as might seem necessary to guarantee the rights and advance the interests of the Catholic Church. Archbishop von Vicari adopted a similar policy, and, as early as November, 1861, came to an understanding with the authorities of the Grand Duchy of Baden concerning certain provisions of the Law of October 9, 1860. The adjustment of difficulties was rendered comparatively easy in his case from the fact that Paragraphs I. and VII. of the Law guaranteed the independence of the Church. Having expressed a wish that the government would secure the Church in the enjoyment of her existing rights, in regard to *Catholic schools*, *foundations*, and *revenues*, he received a promise, on the 5th of November, 1861, that no change would be made in these matters. In the face of these pledges, and in defiance of the protests of the archbishop and the remonstrances of the Catholic subjects of the Grand Duchy, a sovereign edict was issued, August 12, 1862, providing for the organization of an Undenominational School Board, declaring Catholic schools *institutions of the State*, and taking the administration of the funds, set apart for the support of Catholic establishments of learning

---

with Reference to Hirscher's Writings, Carlsruhe, 1854. State Sovereignty and Church Authority, being a Letter to Hirscher, Darmstadt, 1854. Truth and Semblance (against Hirscher), Carlsruhe, 1854. Archbp. Herman of Freiburg and the Government of Baden, Lps. 1854. The Bishops' Struggle on the Rhine, Frcft. 1854. *Venedey*, The Pataria of the XIth and XIXth Centuries (against the addresses to the Archbp.), Aarau, 1854.

[1] **Dr. Maas*, The Convention of Baden and the Legal Proceedings arising out of its Execution (Archives of Cath. Can. Law, by *Moy*, 1860 and 1861). The work was published separately at Innsbruck, 1861, together with an account of the literature relating to the same subject.

[2] *Dr. Seitz*, The Affair of the Catholic Church in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, Mentz, 1861.

Hosted by Google

and charity, from the Catholic Committee on foundations, and transferring it to non-Catholic State officials, to whom, it was said, it of right belonged. This was a bolder stroke than had yet been dealt at the liberties of the Catholics. It brought the controversy home to their own doors. To have their children deprived of such education as they wished to give them was something they could fully understand and appreciate. They held public meetings, organized public demonstrations, and availed themselves of every possible legal means to express their dissatisfaction with the school-law and to place obstacles in the way of its execution. The clergy, though no longer *ex officio* directors of education, were still eligible to the office of School Commissioners; but the archbishop forbade them to take any position on the Boards, and ordered them to confine themselves in the matter of education to the instruction of the people in religious truths. This deprived the Commission, particularly in the rural districts, of the assistance of the only persons capable of properly superintending and managing the schools, a circumstance that was seriously detrimental to the interests of national education. On the 14th of July, 1864, Pope Pius IX. addressed a letter to Herman von Vicari, Archbishop of Freiburg, praising the constancy and courage of that prelate in defending the rights of the Church, particularly in the matter of education. Education, said the Holy Father, without religious training and instruction, can produce only an impious and a perverse generation. This is pre-eminently true of primary instruction. In primary schools, in which are gathered together the tender youth of all classes, religious instruction must invariably hold the first place, and all other branches be subservient and accessory to it. Hence, such schools must of necessity be under the care and protection of the Church, and all attempts to withdraw them from her guardianship and authority spring from a desire to extinguish the divine light of faith among peoples and nations. Those who aim at separating religion from education, and expelling the influence of the Church from the school-room, aim equally at overthrowing her empire over souls, and ask her to forego the work of man's salvation. It is, therefore, the duty of the Church, not only to insist upon her right of imparting religious instruction in the school-room, but also to warn Catholic parents that schools from which Catholic teaching is excluded can hardly, if at all, be frequented with a safe conscience.[1]

In the midst of these politico-religious agitations, the archbishop, broken in health and borne down with weight of years, ended his troubled episcopate at the age of ninety-five, April 13, 1868. He had celebrated, on the 25th of the preceding month, his silver jubilee, or twenty-fifth anniversary, as metropolitan of the Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine, amid the general rejoicing of the Catholics of his flock.

Owing to the difficulties, which necessarily arose between the Metropolitan Chapter and the government, in the selection of a proper person to succeed to the see, it has continued vacant down to the present moment. An understanding, however, has been arrived at between the civil authorities, on the one hand, and the Vicar-Capitular and titular Bishop, *Dr. Kübel*, on the other,

[1] Cf. Archives of Canon Law, 1864. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

concerning the administration of Church property and the admission of priests to serve on local School Boards, but it is only provisional and temporary.[1]

Contrasting the Church in Germany since 1848 with her condition at the opening of the century, we see many tokens of a revival of religious life and of the enjoyment of a larger freedom, which are very consoling to those who have her interests at heart. At the close of the last century and the beginning of this, everything seemed hastening to destruction or already in ruins; Catholic progress had nearly ceased; Catholic life had become almost extinct; every one appeared possessed of a fatal spirit of listlessness and indifference; men of scientific attainments had lost all manliness and dignity, and either abstained altogether from speaking out in defense of the Church, or, if they did so at all, their hesitating accents and faltering words showed but too plainly that their loyalty to truth was seriously impaired by their dread of giving offense to princes and sovereigns.

Things have now everywhere undergone a change more or less encouraging. The Church has recovered from the effects of secularization, and her external organization is again restored; she is now poor, and no longer tempts cupidity or excites envy; her interests, heretofore neglected, or only indifferently promoted, are now jealously guarded by an active and vigilant *press*;[2] firmness and courage have succeeded to hesitancy and cowardice; formerly, wholly ignored or eliciting only the contemptuous pity of Protestants, she now

[1] The publishing house of *Herder*, at Freiburg, has issued the following works relative to the school question: Memorial of the Archbishop of Freiburg on the Condition of Schools, 1863; Official Documents on the School Question in Baden, First Number (1864), Second (1866); Memorial of the Catholic Clergy of the Grand Duchy of Baden concerning Reform in the Public Schools, 1863.

[2] The following are the headings of the subjects treated in a work entitled *The Catholic Press of Germany*, published at Freiburg, in Brisgovia, in 1861: 1. Political papers; 2. Purely ecclesiastical organs; 3. Periodicals devoted to science, literature, and art; 4. Journals and magazines devoted to political and social science and belles-lettres. Cf., also, The Power of the Press, or A Word in Season, Ratisbon, 1866. *Molitor*, The Organization of the Catholic Daily Press, Spire, 1867; and *J. Lukas*, The Press an Instrument of Confusion, Ratisbon, 1867.

Hosted by Google

causes them intense and unnecessary alarm, and provokes their malignant hostility. To them Catholics say, in the words of St. Ambrose: "*We have no wish to frighten you, nor will we be frightened by you,* "*Nec terremus nec timemus.*"

We see ample proofs of this revival of Catholicity in Germany in the increased freedom enjoyed by the bishops and in the zeal and energy with which they take up and carry forward whatever promotes the interests or contributes to the glory of the Church. At the beginning of the century they were indifferent, if not actually hostile, to the Head of the Church; they are now among his ablest defenders and most ardent sympathizers. *Melchior von Diepenbrock, John von Geissel, Othmar von Rauscher,*[1] *Herman von Vicari,* and a number of other bishops, encouraged and stimulated by the example of the illustrious archbishops, *Clemens Augustus von Droste* and *Martin von Dunin,*[2] displayed in the government of their several dioceses a vigorous and varied activity quite unknown for years in Germany. *Provincial and diocesan synods,* which had been long interrupted, were again held. Pastoral letters were written, as the occasion required, whose spirit carries the mind to the early days of the Church. After the pattern of the Fathers, the bishops wrote treatises upon great religious and social questions, which, for eloquence and beauty of style, will compare favorably with their great models. The sacerdotal spirit was revived, strengthened, and kept alive by *spiritual retreats,* held annually; and the better to keep their energies from flagging and their zeal from growing cold, many of the priests, on the eleven-hundredth anniversary of the martyrdom of St. Boniface, in 1855, solemnly pledged themselves to repair once in the year to *Fulda,* for the purpose of going through the spiritual exercises. The *right of association,* which was also recognized as inherent in the Church, gave rise to numerous *congregations of men and women.* Apart from the fact that these are essential to the full development of Christianity, they are also necessary to minister to the

[1] Card. *von Rauscher,* Pastoral, Sermons, and Addresses, Vienna, 1860.

[2] See p. 766 sq.

Hosted by Google

wants of society.[1] This was acknowledged by Napoleon I., who, at the conclusion of the Concordat of 1801, declared: "I have need of monasteries for great crimes, great virtues, and great misfortunes." These institutions, to which so much hostility was manifested at the beginning of the century, now rose rapidly in public favor. Not content with reviving religious life by cultivating a spirit of prayer within the walls of their convents, and going about giving missions to the people, the religious of both sexes ministered to the wants and relieved the sufferings of all classes of society with a spirit of loving generosity and disinterested self-sacrifice at once admirable and heroic. Emulating the French Sisters of Charity in the war of the Crimea, the female religious of Germany moved like angels of mercy over the battle-fields of Schleswig-Holstein in 1864; of Bohemia, during the fratricidal war of 1866; and of France, during the war of 1870, encouraging the living and comforting the dying.

Associations of laymen were also formed, who vied with the religious in works of charity and general beneficence. The first of these was organized at Mentz, the metropolitan see of St. Boniface, and called the "*Pius Society*," after the then illustrious Head of the Church. In their first *General Congress*, from the 3d to the 5th of October, 1848, presided over by *von Buss*, of Freiburg, one of the ablest champions of the Catholic cause,[2] they resolved that all the Catholic societies of Germany should form a Union, to be known as "*The Catholic Association of Germany;*" that its character should be, not political, but *purely religious;* that it should be entirely subject to the Pope, the bishops, and the clergy; and that general congresses should be held at intervals, to be determined by the last General Congress. Its *objects* were stated to be to secure and retain the *liberties* necessary for the Catholic Church

[1] Cf. Vol. I., p. 744, "Freiburg Kirchenblatt," nros. 23–25, of the year 1858, and the magnificent speech of *Dr. Moufang* in the Eleventh General Assembly of the Catholic Associations at Freiburg in 1859, in the official report, p. 223–230. Cf., also, *Schels*, The Modern Religious Congregations of Women and their Legal Relations, Schaffhausen, 1857. *Schuppe*, The Nature and Legal Position of Modern Religious Associations of Women, Mentz, 1869.

[2] Cf. *Werner*, Hist of Cath. Theology since the Council of Trent, p. 513–516.

Hosted by Google

in the exercise of her legitimate functions; to promote the *religious and social condition of the people* by teaching and example; and, above all, to cultivate among its members a love for works of Christian charity. The bishops assembled at Würzburg, November, 13, 1848, expressed their entire approval of the Association, and Pius IX., writing from Gaëta, February 10, 1849, did the same, and graciously conferred upon it his apostolic benediction.[1] From this time forth *General Congresses* were held annually in one of the principal cities of Germany.[2] These were attended by large numbers of the loyal children of the Church, both clerical and lay, and gave a powerful stimulus to religious life and works of Christian charity. At the very first General Congress, the *Societies of St. Vincent de Paul* and *St. Elizabeth* were founded; and in the succeeding Congresses the *Society of St. Boniface*, for providing missions for Catholics whose lot is cast among Protestants, and the *Trades Union Association*, were founded and perfected. Some idea may be had of the good accomplished by the St. Boniface Society from the fact that since its organization the missions, which it was designed to promote, have increased sixty-one per cent. The Trades Union, which has about sixty thousand members, is of vast importance from a social point of view. Among those who labored most earnestly for its success were *Adolphus Kolping*, of Cologne, a man thoroughly acquainted with the social condition of the poor; *Alban Stolz*, of Freiburg, the gifted Catholic popular writer; and *Dr. A. Gruscha*, of Vienna. *The Society for Catholic Art*, *The Vienna Catholic Literary Gazette* (since 1854), and *The Society for the Publication of Pamphlets*, all had their origin in these Congresses of the Catholic Asso-

[1] For a detailed statement of their origin and operations, cf. the "Official Report" of the Eleventh General Assembly at Freiburg, in Brisgovia, ibid., 1860, p. 15–35.

[2] They were held successively at Mentz, 1848; Breslau, 1849; Ratisbon; Linz; Mentz; Münster; Vienna; Lintz; Salzburg; Cologne, 1858; Freiburg; Prague; Munich; Aix-la-Chapelle; Frankfort-on-the-Main; Würzburg; Trevès, 1865; in 1866 suspended by reason of the German fratricidal war; Innsbruck, 1867; Bamberg, 1868; Düsseldorf, 1869; in 1870 no Congress, on account of the Franco-German war; Mentz, 1871. An *official report* of each Congress was made and published.

Hosted by Google

ciation of Germany. Among the other enterprises proposed by it were the foundation of a free *Catholic University;* the support of eminent Catholic scholars; the religious care of the Catholic Germans dispersed in the various capitals of Europe; the organization of Catholic committees on emigration at Hamburg, Antwerp, and Havre; the spread of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin in all the callings of life, but particularly among the younger merchants; the publication of *tracts for the times*,[1] with a view to refuting the slanders of the anti-Catholic press and disarming prejudice against the Church; the investigation of the *questions concerning workingmen;* and, finally, the devising of the most efficient means for resisting the threatened danger of *separation of Church and School.* The Association also solemnly protested, time and again, against the invasion and sacrilegious usurpation of the States of the Church; against the persecution of Catholics in Poland and Ireland, in Mecklenburg and Schleswig-Holstein; and against the injustice done to Catholics in the States of Germany, where, though legally and theoretically enjoying equal rights with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, they were far from doing so practically and in reality.[2] The words uttered in the Congresses literally went out to the ends of all Germany, everywhere evoking a hearty response, stirring up the zeal of the faithful, and kindling anew a love for the old Church.

Generous donations of money were contributed by the members, with the aid of which new parishes were organized and many new churches built in the pure Gothic style, while those that were unfinished were completed, and those going to decay restored. The ornamentation of these churches, both in the interior and on the exterior, was symbolical of the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity, commemorative of events in the lives of the Saints of God, and in the most approved style of *revived Christian art.* There were tokens everywhere of greater

[1] Published at Soest, Münster, Frankfort-on-the Main, and at Vienna.

[2] Cf. Memorial on the Equality of Rights (of Catholics and Protestants) at the *University of Bonn*, Freiburg in Brisgovia, 1862; Illustration of the Equality of Rights in Prussia in Regard to Higher and Intermediate Schools, ibid., 1862.

Hosted by Google

zeal and earnestness. The people grew more religious, the churches were more thronged, the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist were more frequented, *pilgrimages* and other *extraordinary forms of devotion* gained in popular favor, and a decided preference was manifested for the grave and stately church music of earlier ages and for the older forms of prayer and meditation, whose efficacious, sweet, and soothing influence over mind and heart was soon apparent. The face of the land seemed changed, and it was this vision of beauty that impelled *Beda Weber*, a disciple of St. Benedict, and one of the most loyal sons of the Church, who has given so ravishing a picture of it in his *Cartoons*, to cry out in a spirit of exultant gladness, shortly before his death, that he rejoiced to see Germany once more openly Catholic. But the picture, though beautiful in the foreground, had dark shadows in the distance. The enthusiasm of the people, as will always happen in great revivals of faith and devotion, carried them in some instances to excess. Outward demonstration was mistaken for true piety of heart, eccentricity for more rigorous observance, and moroseness for austerity. Miracles without warrant and prophecies without authentication gained credence with the multitude, and upright men were shocked to witness the scandalous lives of some who professed to be practical Catholics. Nor was this all. Many, yielding to the materialistic tendencies of the age, to its selfishness and its sensuality, ceased to act from principle or from high motives, and lost all steadiness and nobility of character. They grew indifferent to the Church, careless of her interests, neglectful of her ministrations, and, not unfrequently, declaimed against her teachings, and avowed themselves her open enemies. In a word—and it is well to say it openly before the world—never have apostasies from the Church and from Christianity itself been more numerous and alarming than in our own day. "It is doubtful," said *Vincent Gasser*, Prince-Bishop of Brixen, "if the Catholic Church has ever had to sustain more terrible assaults. When she first set out on her march of victory over the world, she found the human race sunk in materialism and sick with the sickness of death. But the poison was

Hosted by Google

then external to her. It has now shown marks of its presence in her own body."[1]

The history of Catholicity in *Switzerland* presents an alternation of good and bad fortune.[2] Two causes may be mentioned as mainly instrumental in remedying the evils consequent upon the suppression of the convents in Argovia and the disastrous war of the *Sonderbund*. In the first place, the *bishops* were zealous, active, and laborious, and some of them, of whom *Dr. Greith* was the most eminent, were accomplished writers; and next, the laymen, with that natural genius for organization so peculiar to their countrymen, formed associations for various charitable purposes. Such was the character of the *Society of Pius IX.*, the *Society of Students*, and the *Society of Artists*. When fresh controversies arose between the civil authorities of Argovia, on the one side, and the Bishop of Bâle-Soleure and the Papal Nuncio, on the other, concerning *mixed marriages;* and in the Canton of St. Gall, concerning the school question, the power of the *Catholic press*, its ability, and harmony of action attracted universal attention.[3] After the accession to power at *Geneva* of *James Fazy* and his political adherents, who professed a liberal policy toward the Church, Bishop *Marilley*, who had been since 1848 the victim of unceasing persecution, and was now in exile, was permitted to return to his diocese (1856), and on the 8th of September, 1859, dedicated a magnificent Gothic church to the Blessed Virgin, in the presence of four bishops and one hundred and fifty priests, in the very citadel of Calvinism, where, until the year 1793, it had been a capital offense to say Mass. In 1872 this venerable confessor of the faith was succeeded in the see of Geneva by Bishop *Mermillod*, an eloquent preacher and a capable administrator.

The growth of Catholicity in the home of Calvin and the nursery of his teachings is very considerable, whether the

[1] Cf. his speech, delivered at the Eighteenth General Congress of the Catholic Association, at Innsbruck, 1867.

[2] See § 405.

[3] The Swiss Gazette; The Ecclesiastical Gazette of Switzerland, published at Soleure; The Literary and Artistic Paper of Lucerne; The Catholic School Journal of Switzerland; The Historical Papers of Switzerland, etc.

Hosted by Google

number or the influence of its professors be considered. In 1866, when it was proposed to force upon the country some objectionable reforms, the Catholics unanimously opposed them, and largely contributed to their rejection. The revival of learning and religious life in Switzerland is mainly the work of the Benedictines of the venerable *monastery of Einsiedeln*, among whom there have been many writers of distinguished merit, like Fathers Gallus Morel and Charles Brandes. The ancient monastery of *Rheinau*, after an unbroken existence of eleven hundred years, was suppressed in 1862 by the government of the Canton of Zürich; and the last remaining convent of women in the Canton of Argovia, situated at Baden, was closed in 1867. But, strange to say, there are at present more convents and religious institutions in Catholic Switzerland than she possessed before the war of the Separate Confederacy. There appears, however, to be no end to the persecution of the Church in that country. In 1859 the right of jurisdiction, hitherto enjoyed by the Bishops of Milan and Como, in the Canton of *Tessino*, was abrogated; the right of dismissing pastors and appointing others to their places vested in the individual congregations; the entire superintendence of worship placed in the hands of the police; and Catholic schools were closed. The spirit of persecution once more broke out in Geneva; the teaching Orders were driven out; Bishop *Mermillod*, the Vicar Apostolic, expelled (February 17, 1873); laws enacted for the regulation of worship; and pastors, who refused to take the oath, deposed, and apostate priests appointed in their room. *Dr. Greith* has set forth, in a number of memorials, the persecutions suffered by the Catholics of the Canton of Saint-Gall, of which he was bishop. But perhaps no diocese of Switzerland was so severely tried as that of *Basle*. The Deputies of the seven Cantons comprising this diocese, assembled in conference, decided to close the ecclesiastical seminary of Soleure, which had been opened in 1858, many convents in the various Cantons having been previously suppressed. The Deputies also sent a peremptory command to Mgr. *E. Lachat*, Bishop of Basle, to explain his course in regard to papal infallibility, and to withdraw the sentence of excommunication passed upon the Old Catholic

Hosted by Google

pastors, *Egli*, *Gschwind*, and others. The bishop, having refused compliance, was deposed on the 29th of January, 1873, and on the 17th of the following April expelled from Soleure. In the mountains of Jura the priests, who are sufficiently loyal and courageous to obey their bishops, expiate their fidelity either in prison or exile; and, in the meantime, the people are deprived of the ministrations of religion, as they refuse to have anything to do with apostate priests, who come to fill the places of those taken from them. The Catholic Church of Zürich was taken from its legal owners, and given to the "Old Catholics," whose preachers, acting under the inspiration of Radicals, the enemies of all religion, go up and down the country heaping abuse and slander upon Catholics and their faith. The bishops have time and again sent expostulations to the Federal Council, complaining of these wrongs, and the Papal Nuncio has frequently protested against this abridgment of the liberties of the Church by those who profess to be the champions of freedom, but neither expostulations nor protests have produced the slightest effect. The Holy Father, Pius IX., often sent words of encouragement and comfort to the Swiss, and on the 21st of November, 1873, condemned the action of the Federal Council, whereupon this body, in January, 1874, ordered the Papal Nuncio to leave the country.[1]

But, apart from these persecutions, the progress of the Church in Switzerland has been rapid and important, and no one has contributed more to it than the Capuchin, *Theodosius Florentini*,[2] Vicar General of Coire, who died February 15, 1865.

This child of the mountains exercised a wonderful influence over the minds of men. He was tall of stature, his constitution was robust, and his carriage manly and dignified; he was skilled in philosophy and theology, and was gifted with an eminently practical mind and a heart delicately sensitive to the spiritual and corporal needs of his fellow men. Few men have been more devoted to the Church, more active in her interests, and more reliant on God. He was by turn a school-master, a professor, a parish-priest, a manufacturer, and a

[1] Cf. *Brück*, Ch. Hist., pp. 782 sq. The sources for this portion of the history may also be found there. (Tr.)

[2] A Short Biography of Father *Theodosius Florentini*, Coire, 1865.

Hosted by Google

vicar-general, and his success in these various and varied positions was uniform and remarkable. He founded *schools and academies for boys and girls*, and provided them with competent teachers; he opened *hospitals* and *orphanages;* he introduced silk-weaving, straw-platting, knitting, and the manufacture of cotton into various districts of Switzerland; and the manufacture of woollen goods into far away Bohemia; and was thus instrumental in banishing poverty from these localities; but his thoughts were chiefly occupied with founding monastic houses and providing religious instruction for the people. Having perfected the organization and discipline of existing monasteries, and directed the energies of their inmates to the work contemplated by their founders, he established at *Schwytz* the *College of Mary of Help*, including a lyceum, a gymnasium, a smaller seminary, and a training school, to which he appointed eleven clerical and eight lay professors. But the most splendid creation of his zeal was the *Hospital of the Holy Cross* at Coire, to which a novitiate of the Sisters of Charity was attached, until the foundation of their house at *Ingenbohl*, from which so many of these devoted heroines go forth to carry the blessings of their ministrations to the neighboring districts. They were called the *Sisters of Charity of the Holy Cross.* The range of their employment was wide and varied, and they spread rapidly through the Cantons of Switzerland, and established missions in Austria, the Grand Duchy of Baden, and Prussia. Millions of money were required to start these numerous enterprises and keep them going, but Father Theodosius never seemed to want; his inventive charity provided means where utter failure would have overtaken others. Whenever he felt that there was a call upon him to relieve some pressing need of his fellow men, seizing his pilgrim's staff, he would set forth on foot, traversing Italy from the Alps to the Straits of Messina, preaching along the whole route of his journey, and collecting for his contemplated works of benevolence and charity. He would do the same in Switzerland, in Bavaria, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, and in Austria, where especially his appeals met with a prompt and generous response. His easy address and winning manners won him the good will and esteem of those not of his own faith. The last words penned by his hand express the rule of his life and contain the secret of his success. When on his death-bed at Heiden, in the Canton of *Appenzell*, being requested by one of the company of the friends who stood by him to leave them some remembrance, he wrote on the page of a memorandum book this old Catholic maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.*

§ 419. *Catholic Literature in Germany since the Opening of the Nineteenth Century.*

* Thesaurus librorum rei catholicae. Manual of Catholic Bibliography, Würzburg, 1848–1850, 2 vols. *Hülskamp* and *Rump*, Literary Guide (Literarischer Handweiser), 1862–1866. To this is added the very practical alphabetical index. † *Charles Werner*, Hist. of Catholic Theology in Germany from the Council of Trent, Munich, 1866. By the *same*, Hist. of Apologetical and Controversial Literature, Vol. V., Schaffhausen, 1867 (Hist. of Christian Apologetics in these Latter Days).

Hosted by Google

Traces of the spirit of Josephism did not wholly disappear from the theological literature of Germany until after the Church had come triumphant out of the conflict in which she had been engaged, when men rose up, even from among her enemies, whose splendid intellectual gifts and generous impulses enabled them to comprehend and appreciate the truth, and fitted them to defend it with that breadth of view, elevation of sentiment, and persuasive beauty of language which the Spirit of God alone inspires. Among these were the illustrious *converts* of whom mention has already been made.[1] Their theological writings are distinguished by that breadth and dignity of treatment so becoming the most noble of sciences. As *Stolberg* led the way to a more profound study of history, and in particular of Church history, so was *Schlegel* the pioneer of *Catholic journalism* in Germany. He was the founder of the *German Museum*, which was followed by the *Europe*, the *Athenaeum*, the *Austrian Observer*, and other journals devoted to the defense of Catholic doctrine and the elucidation of every branch of science, embracing in their scope the treatment of theology, ecclesiastical history, political economy, philosophy, philology, poetry, and the fine arts.[2]

Schlegel, being on terms of intimacy with many of the disciples of what was known as the Romantic School, his conversion to Catholicity, when it took place in 1829, produced a

[1] We may be permitted to quote here the splendid testimony which *Henry Heine* has borne to the Catholic Church. "I am too well acquainted with history," says he, "not to be struck with admiration at that gigantic monument known as the Catholic Church. Call her the bastile of the soul, if you like; say, if you will, that she is defended by imbeciles; it is still true that it is not easy to take this bastile, and many a rash assailant will yet perish before her walls. As a thinker and a metaphysician, I have ever been forced to admire the consistency of her dogmas, and even as a poet I feel bound to pay her the same homage."

[2] Cfr. *William von Schütz*, Anticelsus, a Quarterly, 1842, nro. 1; *Staudenmaier*, Remembrance of Frederic von Schlegel, Tübingen Quarterly, 1832, p. 607–650. Schlegel's *Earlier Works*, Vienna, 1822–1826, 10 vols.; then, Lectures on Modern History, Vienna, 1811; Philosophy of History, Vienna, 1829; Philosophy of Life, Vienna, 1827; Philosophy of Language, Vienna, 1830. The last four, and other works, have been translated into English. His posthumous works were published by *Windischmann*, Bonn, 1836, 1837, 2 vols. His complete works were published in 15 vols., 1822–1846.

Hosted by Google

powerful effect on the minds of many of his former friends, and, while it was instrumental in bringing some into the Church, it entirely alienated others. *Adam Müller*, a man of extensive learning, treated politics from a Catholic point of view in the *German State Advertiser* (*Deutsche Staatsanzeiger*),[1] and *Jarcke* and *Phillips* followed him in the same field with equal ability in the *Berlin Political Weekly*.[2] These journals were the forerunners of the *ecclesiastico-political papers*, of which we shall have occasion to speak farther on. These were days when the Catholic Church was misunderstood and her doctrines falsified and misrepresented, and hence there was an urgent need of Catholic apologists to correct slanders and refute false statements. This was ably done by *Kastner*, Abbot *Prechtl*, *Brenner*, *Geiger*, and others; while *Binterim*, possessing a vast store of historical knowledge, and as zealous as he was learned, labored for close upon half a century with unflagging energy in the interests of the Church († 1855). Popular expositions of Catholic doctrine were written by *Onymus*, *Ildephonsus Schwarz*, *Sambuga*, *Schwarzhueber*, *Widmer*, and Bishop *Frint;* but none of these attracted so large a share of attention by their writings as Bishop *Sailer*, whose *Fundamental Doctrines of Religion* inspired a respect for Christianity in the minds of university students, and taught them that religion, and religion alone, is capable of raising man to his true dignity. He also translated the *Letters of All Ages*, which contributed powerfully to withdraw many from the seductions of false science, and lead them back to the truth. "He stood like a solitary light-house in the midst of the surging waves of rationalism and unbelief, and to him all those who still believed in Christ and hoped for salvation through Him, turned their wistful gaze." [3]

Schnappinger, of Freiburg, *Galura*, *Hagel*, and *Waibel* wrote chiefly on *positive theology*, but their works are much inferior to those of *Liebermann*, who has been quite recently followed

[1] *Adam von Müller*, Complete Works, Munich, 1839 sq.

[2] *Jarcke*, Miscellanea, Munich, 1839 sq., 3 vols. *Phillips*, Miscellany, Ratisbon, 3 vols.

[3] *Aichinger*, in his Preface to the Life of John Michael Sailer, Bishop of Ratisbon, Freiburg, 1865.

Hosted by Google

by *Prunyi*, *Penka*, *Schwetz*, and some others. *Oberthür* gave special prominence to the biblical side of theology;[1] while *Hermes*, taking Stattler as his model, aimed at correcting the influence of Kantism, by constructing dogmatical theology upon a strictly philosophical basis, and showing the close and essential connection between the several dogmas, one by one, and all the rest.[2] *Zimmer*,[3] and in a measure *Seber*[4] also, following in the wake of Hermes, attempted to build a system of theology upon the principles of Schelling's philosophy of identity. *Dobmayer*[5] and *Brenner*[6] took as the basis of their system the idea of the *City of God*, but, failing to give consistency to their plan, they finally abandoned it; whence *Bittner* made another effort to do justice to the subject.[7]

Besides his other valuable contributions to Catholic theology, *Drey* also wrote a masterly apology for Christianity.[8] After the example of Dobmayer, *Francis Baader* treated dogmatical theology from a speculative point of view, but in his philosophical notions he was too close a follower of the theosophic system of Jacob Böhme,[9] and was not unfrequently at variance with the teachings of the Church. His disciple, *Francis Hoffmann*,[10] of Würzburg, though a more orderly and

[1] *Schnappinger*, Doctrina dogmatum eccles. christ. cathol. ad usus academ., Aug. Vind. 1816, 2 T. As to the others, see Thesaurus, etc. *Fr. Liebermann*, Institt. theolog., in several editions, Mentz. *Prunyi*, Theol. dogmatica christiano-catholica. *Penka*, Praelectiones ex theologia dogmat. exaratae. *Schwetz*, Theologia dogmatica catholica. *Oberthür*, Idea biblica ecclesiae Dei.

[2] Vide infra, § 419.

[3] *Zimmer*, Veritas christ. religionis s. theol. chr. dogm. II. P. Aug. Vindelic. 1789, 1790; Theol. christ. specialis ac theoret., Landish. 1802–1806; Philosophy of Religion, Landshut, 1805.

[4] *Seber*, Religion and Theology, Cologne, 1823.

[5] *Dobmayer*, Systema theolog. cath. opus posthum. cur. *Senestrey*. VIII. T., Solisb. 1807–1819; In compend. redact. ab E. Salomon, 2 T., Solisb. 1813.

[6] Delineation of Theology from "The City of God," Bamberg, 1817–1819, 3 vols. Revised edition, entitled System of Catholic Speculative (?) Theology, Ratisbon, 1838.

[7] *Franc. Bittneri*, Posn. doctoris et professoris theologi de civitate divina commentarii, Mogunt. 1845. (Compend. dogm. complet.)

[8] *Von Drey*, Apology or Scientific Demonstration of the Divinity of Christianity, Mentz, 1838, 3 vols.

[9] See p. 314.

[10] *F. Hoffmann*, Introduction to the Speculative Teachings of Baader,

Hosted by Google

luminous writer than his master, upon many of whose obscure passages he threw a flood of light, is, nevertheless, at times difficult to understand. Of the writers who treated speculative theology, *Günther*,[1] *Papst*,[2] *Veith*[3] of Vienna, *Klee*,[4] *Staudenmaier*,[5] *Kuhn*,[6] *Baltzer*, *Berlage*, *Dieringer*, *Oswald*, *Zukrigl*, and *Denziger* are remarkable for their lucidity and scientific precision. The last named published a very careful review of the dogmatic decisions of the Church. *Sheeben* gave life and warmth to his treatise on dogmatic theology by introducing into his scholasticism an element of mysticism;[7] but per-

Aschaffenburg, 1836; Introduction to Theology and Philosophy, ibid., 1836; Edition of Baader's Works.

[1] *Anthony Günther* († February 24, 1863), Introduction to Speculative Theology in the form of Letters, Vienna, 1828 and 1846–1848, 2 vols.; Lights North and South on the Horizon of Speculative Theology, Vienna, 1832; The Feast of Peregrinus, Vienna, 1830; Eurystheus and Heracles, Vienna, 1843; Thomas a Scrupulis, Vienna, 1835; The Faces of Janus in Relation to Philosophy and Theology, the joint production of himself and *Papst*, Vienna, 1834; The "Juste-Milieux" of German Philoscphy in the Present Age, Vienna, 1838 and 1843; The Last Symbol, 1844; Outlines of Metaphysics, 1848; Lydia, or an Annuary of Philosophy, written conjointly with *Veith*.

[2] *Papst*, Is there a Philosophy of Positive Christianity? Cologne, 1832. Man and His History, Vienna, 1830. On Ecstasy, Cologne, 1833. Adam and Christ.

[3] *Veith*, The "Our Father," or Illustrations of the Lord's Prayer, Vienna, 1831; 3d ed., 1842; Engl. transl. by *E. Cox*, London, 1849. "Eucharistia," Vienna, 1847. Homilies, 5 vols. (Tr.)

[4] *Klee*, System of Catholic Dogmatics, Bonn, 1831. Dogmatics, Mentz, 1839, 3 vols. History of Dogmas, Mentz, 1837 sq., 2 vols. Outlines of Catholic Morals, posthumous ed., by *Himioben*, Mentz, 1843.

[5] *Staudenmaier* († 1856), Hist. of the Election of Bishops, Tübingen, 1830. The Practical Manifestation of the Gifts of the Spirit (*Tüb. Quart.*, 1828), Tüb. 1835. Scotus Erigena, Frkft. 1833. Encyclopaedia of Theological Sciences (Mentz, 1834), 2d ed., Vol. I., 1840. Universities and the Interior Organization of Scientific Instruction, Freiburg, 1839. Philosophy of Christianity, or Metaphysics of the Holy Scriptures, Giessen, 1840, Vol. I. Genius of Christianity (Mentz, 1835), 7th ed., 1860, 2 vols. Nature of the Cath. Church, Freiburg, 1845. About Religious Pacification in the Future, Freiburg, 1846, 3 pts. Christian Dogmatics, Freiburg, 1844 sq. Religious Mission of the Present Age, Freiburg, 1848. Cfr. *Freiburg* Cyclopaed., Vol. XII., p. 1151 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 22, p. 387.

[6] *Kuhn*, Jacobi and the Philosophy of His Age, Mentz, 1834. Catholic Dogmatics, Tübingen, 1846 sq.; 2d ed., 1859.

[7] *Berlage*, Apologetics of the Church, Münster, 1834. Introduction to and Systematization of Catholic Dogmatics, Münster, 1834, 6 vols. *Dieringer*, Sys-

Hosted by Google

haps no writer of this century did more to rouse men from the indifference into which they were lapsing, in consequence of the negative character of Protestantism, than *John Adam Möhler*,[1] whose *Symbolism*, in which is embodied so extensive a knowledge of ecclesiastical history and patristic science, carried the thoughts of his contemporaries, whether clerical or lay, back to the early ages of the Church, and produced upon their minds a powerful impression in favor of Catholicity. In the hope of making a stand against the growing infidelity of the age, *Reinerding*, *Ehrlich*, *Vosen*, and *Hettinger*[2] published apologetical writings in defense of the doctrines that were most violently assailed. Bishops *von Ketteler*, of Mentz, and *Conrad Martin*, of Paderborn, both men of unusual learning and ability, also dissipated many errors in doctrine, and corrected many prejudices against the Church by their apologetical works.[3] It is gratifying to see the zeal and even

tematism of the Divine Facts of Christianity, 2d ed., Mentz, 1857. *Manual* of Catholic Dogmatics, 5th ed., Mentz, 1865. *Catechism for the Laity*, Mentz, 1865. *H. Oswald*, Dogmatic Teaching on the Sacraments, 2d ed., Münster, 1864. (His "Dogmatic Mariology," Lat.: Mariologia Dogmatica, hoc est: Systematica expositio totius doctrinae de B. Virgine, was, by decree of December 6, 1855, put on the Index. *Auctor laudabiliter se subjecit et opus reprobavit.* Index. libror. prohib., p. 239, ed. Mechlin., 1860. (Tr.) *Zukrigl*, Scientific Vindication of the Christian *Dogma of the Trinity*, Vienna, 1846. *Denzinger*, Four Books of Religious Knowledge, Würzburg, 1846, 2 vols., and Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum de rebus fidei et morum, Wirceburgi, ed. IV., 1865. *Scheeben*, The Mysteries of the Christian Religion, Freiburg, 1865.

[1] *Moehler* († April 12, 1838), *Unity of the Church*, 2d ed., 1847. *St. Athanasius the Great* and the Church of His Age, Mentz, 2d ed., 1844. *Symbolism*, or Doctrinal Differences between Protestants and Catholics, Mentz, 1833; 8th ed., 1872; Engl. transl. by J. B. Robertson, New York, 1844. *New Investigations* of the Doctrinal Points Controverted between Catholics and Protestants, 2d ed., Mentz. 1835. *Miscellanea*, published by Doellinger, Ratisbon, 1839, 2 vols. See *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. VII., p. 159 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 15, p. 166 sq. *Woerner-Gams* (The Life of), John Adam Moehler, Ratisbon, 1866.

[2] *Reinerding*, Theologia fundamentalis, Münster, 1864. *Ehrlich*, Fundamental Theology, Prague, 1859 sq. *Vosen*, Christianity and the Protests of Its Adversaries against It, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1864. *Hettinger*, Apologia of Christianity, 4th ed., Freiburg, 1872 (is being transl. into Portuguese). Cfr. *Literary Guide*, No. 32, p. 54 sq.

[3] *Bp. von Ketteler*, The Rights and Guarantees of the Catholic Church in Germany, 5th ed., 1854; Liberty and Authority of the Church, 7th ed., 1862; The Labor Question and Christianity, 3d ed., 1864; May a Christian who has Faith

Hosted by Google

enthusiasm with which the *history of dogma*, almost totally neglected since the time of Petavius and Thomassin, has been again taken up in these latter days by *Klee*, *Wörter*, *Schwane*, and *Zobl;* and it is equally gratifying to see the evidences of a returning taste for the study of *biblical theology*.[1]

Moral theology has been treated with considerable freedom and some ability by recent authors, and notably by *Geishüttner*, *Reyberger*, *Schenkl*, *Wanker*, and *Riegler*, whose works are infected with the prevailing philosophy of the age, and are philisophical treatises on ethics, rather than expositions of Christian morality. Their works were superseded by *Sailer's Moral Theology* (1817) and *Stapf's Christian Morals*,[2] and these in turn, as well as those of *Braun* and *Vogelsang*, which were tainted with the errors of Hermes, by the writings of *Hirscher*,[3]

be a Freemason? About Religious Instruction in Public Schools; Our Situation in Germany after the War of 1866, 6th ed., 1867. (The True Basis of Religious Pacification, 3d ed., 1868; The Ecumenical Council and Its Influence on Our Age, 5th ed., 1869; The Views of Dr. Falk, Minister of Worship, concerning the Catholic Church, from his Speech of December 10, 1873 (1874). *Bp. Conrad Martin*, Science of Things Divine, being Lectures for the Educated Classes; A Bishop's Word to the Protestants of Germany; Second Work of a Bishop (concerning St. Boniface's Society), etc. (Tr.)

[1] *Klee*, Hist. of Dogmatics, 1837. *Woerter*, The Connection of Free-will with Grace, until the Age of St. Augustine, Freiburg, 1856, 2 vols.; Pelagianism, Freiburg, 1866. *Schwane*, Hist. of Dogmas, Münster, 1862 sq., 2 vols. *Zobl*, Hist. of the Dogmas of the Catholic Church, Innspruck, 1865. Works on biblical theology have been published, above all, by *Bade*, *Koenig*, *Scholz*, and *Simar*. Vide infra, p. 893, n. 3.

[2] *Sailer's* Complete Works, revised and augmented; published by *Widmer*, Sulzbach, 1830–1841, in 40 pts. Cfr. Services rendered by Sailer to the Cause of Catholic Science (*The Catholic*, 1842, September number, p. 247–264). *Stapf*, Christian Morality, Innspruck, 1841, 1842, 4 vols.; Latin, Oeniponti, 1841, 1842 (ed. V.)

[3] *Hirscher* († September 4, 1865), Connection of the Gospel with Modern Scholastic Theology, Tübingen, 1823. Reflections on the Lenten *Gospels* and those of the Ecclesiastical Year (in many editions); Catechetics, 4th ed., Tübingen, 1840; Christian Morality, Tübingen, 1835 sq., 3 vols. (in several editions); Life of Jesus; Large and Small Catechism; Answers to the Great Religious Questions of the Day, Freiburg, 1846 sq.; Life of Mary; Principal Articles of the Catholic Faith; Reflections on the Epistles of the Sundays; His Apprehensions as to the Efficiency of Our Religious Instruction, Freiburg, 1863; On Illusions, Freiburg, 1865; His Smaller Writings, Freiburg, 1868. Cf. *Woerter*, Panegyric of John Baptist Hirscher, Freiburg, 1866.

Hosted by Google

who, from the very outset of his career as a writer, set aside what he considered a corruption of Scholasticism, and confined himself in his *Christian Morals* to a simple and concise exposition of the ethical teaching of the Gospel. This work, which, as it were, opened up a new view of the *Kingdom of God*, was received with universal applause by his contemporaries, whose faith it strengthened, and whose charity it purified. Like Möhler, he exercised a marked influence upon the religious and ecclesiastical tendencies of his age and country, and his *Catechisms* and *Socratic Method of Instruction* were potent in giving direction to the religious instruction of youth. The *Christian* tone and *purely etchical* treatment of morality having been thus restored, quite a number of works on the science appeared in rapid succession from the pens of *Probst* (1848), *Martin*, *Rietter* (1848 and 1867), *Werner* (1850 and 1863), *Fuchs* (1851), *Elger* (1852), *Jocham* (1852), *Dieckhoof* (1853), *Bittner*, *Hähnlein* (1855), *Simar* (1866), *Ernst Müller*,[1] *Kössing* (1868), *Linsenmann*, and *Pruner*, some of whom gave a more positive character to the subject, while others revived the scholastic method, and overcharged their writings with casuistry and canon law.[2]

A great deal has also been done in these latter days to advance the study of *Scripture* and its kindred branches. The work accomplished in this field by Professor *Jahn*[3] of Vienna and Professor *Hug* of Freiburg († 1846), the latter a man of exceptionally fine mental endowments, but daring in his speculations, has received and largely merited the grateful recognition of the learned world. They were followed by *Feilmoser*,[4] *Unterkircher*,[5] *Herbst*, *Welte*,[6] *Movers*, *Scholz* of Bonn, *Friedlieb*, *Haneberg*, *Reusch*, *Danko*, *Scholz* of Breslau, *Maier*

[1] Theologia Moralis, Viennae, 1868, 1869.
[2] Cf. Literary Guide, nros. 56–59, year 1867.
[3] Introduction to the Old Testament, Biblical Archaeology.
[4] Introduction to the New Testament.
[5] Introductio in N. Test.
[6] Introduction to the Old Testament.

Hosted by Google

and *Reithmayr*, *Langen*,[1] *Lutterbeck*,[2] and others. *Jahn*, *Arigler*, *Gerhauser*, *Alber*, *Unterkircher*, *Ranolder*, *Löhnis*, *Schmitter*, *Lomb*, *Güntner*, *Kohlgruber*, and *Wilke*, a convert, wrote on hermeneutics, the last named being also the author of the *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum.* Popular expositions of the New Testament were written by *Schnappinger*, *Kistemaker*, and *Massl;* and of the entire Bible by *Braun*, *Brentano*, *Dereser-Scholz*, *Allioli*, and conjointly by *Loch* and *Reischl.* Commentaries aiming at giving a deeper view of the sense of the Books of the Old and New Testaments were written by *Gügler*, *Leopold Schmid*, *Welte*, *Schegg*, *Reinke*, *Bade*, *König*, *Thalhofer*, *Reusch*, *Klee*, *Mack*, *Stengel*, *Adalbert Maier* of Freiburg, *Maier* of Bamberg, *Aberle* and *Himpel* of Tübingen, *Windischmann*, *Reithmayr*, *Stern*, *Bisping*, *Arnoldi*, *Langen*, *Grimm*, *Simar*, and *Rohling.*[3]

[1] *Scholz*, Introd. to the Books of the O. and of the N. T., Cologne, 1845 sq.; Biblical Archaeology, Bonn, 1834; Novum Testamentum graece, Lips. 1830 sq., 2 T. *Haneberg*, Essay of a Hist. of Biblical Revelation, being an Introduction to the Books of the Old and of the New Testament, 1850; 3d ed., Ratisbon, 1863. The Arabic Translation of the Psalms by Saadia Reviewed, 1840; Religious Antiquities, 1842; 2d ed., 1866. *Messmer*, Hist. of the Revelation, Freiburg, 1857, 2 vols. *Reusch*, Manual of Introduction to the Old Testament, Freiburg, 1859; 4th ed., 1870. *Danko*, Historia revelationis div. Vet. et Nov. Testam., Viennae, 1862–1867, 3 T. *Scholz*, Manual of the Old Testament Theology, Ratisbon, 1861, 2 vols.

[2] *Lutterbeck*, Doctrinal System of the N. T., Mentz, 1852, 2 vols.

[3] *Gügler*, Explanation of the Holy Scriptures through Themselves, Lucerne, 1817 sq., 2 vols. *Schmid*, Interpretation of Genesis, Münster, 1834, 1835. *Welte*, The Book of Job. *Schegg*, Explanation of the Psalms, of Isaias, of the Minor Prophets, and of the Gospels. *Reinke*, De Messiae expiatore, passuro et morituro; Prophecy concerning the B. Virgin and Immanuel; Jacob's Blessing; Brief Explanation of the O. T.; Messianic Psalms; Greater and Minor Prophets, etc. *Bade*, Christology of the O. T., Münster, 2 vols. *Koenig*, Theology of the Psalms, Freiburg, 1857. The Idea of Immortality in the Book of Job, Freiburg, 1855. Old Testament Royalty, Freiburg, 1863. About Walafried Strabo (Freiburg Diocesan Archives, Vol. III.) *Thalhofer*, Exposition of the Psalms, Ratisbon, 1857, and frequently. *Reusch*, Interpretation of the Books of Baruch and Tobias, Freiburg, 1853 sq. *Klee*, Interpretation of the Gospel of St. John and of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. *Mack*, Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle, Tuebingen, 1836. *Stengel*, Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, publ. by *Beck*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1836. *Adalbert Maier*, Introduction to the Books of the N. T., Freiburg, 1852; Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, Freiburg, 1843; On

Hosted by Google

The objections drawn from the natural sciences against the *history of the creation*, as related in the Book of Genesis, have been time and again ably refuted or reconciled with the letter of the Sacred Text by *Reusch*, *Bosizio*, *Veith*, *Baltzer*, and *Michelis*.[1]

Most of the authors who have written on Church history have been already named in the Introduction, but the following may be added to the list as deserving special praise for their excellent monographs, viz: *Döllinger*, *Floss*, *Hefele*, *Scharpff*, *Ginzel*, *Kunstmann*, *Düx*, *Schwab*, *Gfrörer*, *Alfred von Reumont*, *von Hübner*, *Charles Werner*, the most prolific of modern theological writers; *Damberger*, *Marx*, *Hergenröther*, *Reinkens*, *Gams*, *Hagemann*, *Friedrich*, *Funk*, *Hülskamp*, *Rump*, and others. In canon law, works have been produced by *Sauter*, *Frey*, *Schenkl*, *Pelka*, *Walter*, *von Droste*, *Cherier*, *Müller*, *Phillips*, *Permaneder*, *Buss*, *Gitzler*, *Beidtel*, *Pachmann*, *Rosshirt*, *Seitz*, *von Moy* and *Vering*, *Maassen*, *Hüffer*, *Schulte*, *Kober*, *Schöpf*, and *Kunstmann*, *Sentis*, and finally *Gerlach*.

The attention that has recently been given to the study of *Patrology*, or the history of Christian literature, has been very beneficial in many ways to Catholic theology. The first impulse to this branch of ecclesiastical science was given by

---

the Epistle to the Romans, 1847; On the First and Second to the Corinthians; On the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christology of the New Testament, 1871. *Reithmayr* (of Munich), Introd. to the Canonical Books of the N. T., Ratisbon, 1852. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1845; to the Galatians, 1865. *Windischmann*, Explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians, Mentz, 1843. *Stern*, Commentary on the Apocalypse, Schaffhausen, 1854. *Bisping*, Manual of Exegetics for the Epistles of the Apostle Paul; the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, 4 vols., to the Catholic Epistles, partly in new editions, Münster, 1855 sq. *Arnoldi*, Commentary on St. Matthew, Treves, 1856. *Langen*, The Last Days of Jesus, being a Biblico-Historical Essay, Freiburg, 1864; The Condition of the Jews in Palestine during the Times of Jesus Christ, Freiburg, 1866. *Grimm*, Harmony of the Four Gospels, Ratisbon, 1868; The Samaritans, etc., Munich, 1854. *Simar*, The Theology of St. Paul, Freiburg, 1864.

[1] **Reusch*, The Holy Bible and Nature, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1866. *Bosizio*, Hexahemeron and Geology, Mentz, 1865. *Veith*, The Beginnings of Mankind, Vienna, 1865. *Baltzer*, The Mosaic Account of Creation, Lps. 1866 sq. *Michelis*, in the periodical "Nature and Revelation."

Hosted by Google

Möhler.[1] He was followed by *Winter*, *Wiest*, *Busse*, *Goldwitzer*, *Locherer*, and *Annegarn*, whose works on patrology are of comparatively small value; they, however, led the way for abler men in the same field, among whom may be mentioned *Permaneder* and *Fessler*, who wrote in Latin, and *Deutinger*, *Magon*, and *Alzog*,[2] who wrote in German. Valuable contributions were made to *Syriac* literature by *Pius Zingerle*, O. S. B., and *Bickell*.

The beginning made by Austrian scholars on *Pastoral Theology* during the preceding Epoch bore abundant fruit in the present. *Sailer*, the first author of considerable merit in this branch, was followed in rapid succession by *Schwarzel*, *Powondra*, *Reichenberger*, *Hinterberger*, *Zenner*, *Gollowitz*, *Brockmann*, *Herzog*, *Widmer*, *Haiker*, *Zwickenpflug* and *Amberger*, *Pohl* of Breslau, *Kerschbaumer* of St. Pölten, *Schüch* of Kremsmünster, and *Beiger* and *Gassner*. *Homiletics* and *catechetics* were also treated as specialties by many writers;[3] the former by *Hirscher*, *Müller*, *Stolz*, *Schuster*, *Deharbe-Wilmers*, *Jacob Schmitt*, and others; and the latter by *Zarbl*, *Laberentz*, *Fluck*, etc.; while *Schmid*, *Lüft*, *Fluck*, *Kössing*, and *Probst* wrote on *Liturgy*.

The vital importance attached to the religious instruction of the people during these latter years seems to be one of the distinctive characteristics of modern times, and to be appreciated equally by clergymen and laymen. Acting under the advice of *Sailer*, *Bernard Overberg*, of Münster, a priest of great simplicity of life and dignity of manners, drew out in writing a plan for a model parish-school; but he did not stop here; he at once opened and conducted a school such as he had designed, and was gratified, after much labor and disinterested self-sacrifice, at seeing the scheme crowned with complete success.[4] Similar experiments were tried, but with less

[1] Moehler's Patrology, published by *Reithmayr*, Vol. I., Ratisbon, 1840.

[2] *Permaneder*, Bibliotheca patristica, Landishuti, 1841 sq., 3 T. (the first three centuries). *Fessler*, Institutiones Patrologiae, Oeniponte, 1850, 1851, 2 T. (to Pope Gregory the Great, A. D. 604). *Deutinger*, Genius of Christian Tradition, Ratisbon, 1830 sq., 2 vols. *Alzog*, Institutes of Patrology, Freiburg; 1st ed., 1866; 2d ed., 1869; 3d ed., 1876; there are, besides, several editions in French.

[3] *Graf*, A Critical *Exposition of the Present* Condition of *Practical Divinity*, Tuebingen, 1841.

[4] He died November 9, 1826.

Hosted by Google

success, by *Braun* in Bavaria, by *Werkmeister* in Würtemberg, and by *Demeter* in Baden.

Works on *pedagogics* were written by *Stapf*, *Milde*, *Hergenröther*, *Barthel*, and *Dursch*, that of the last-named being especially good. But the most eminent writer in this branch of ecclesiastical science was *Kellner*, First Counsellor of State and Commissioner of Education, whose writings have done a vast deal of good.[1] Besides the praiseworthy and meritorious efforts of *Giles Jais* and *Christopher Schmid* to provide religious instruction for old and young, *Alban Stolz* and *Conrad von Bolanden*, of the diocese of Spire, have achieved eminent success in the same field, and, as writers of religious tales and other works of a similar drift, have never been equaled.[2] *The Encyclopaedia of Systematic Education and Instruction*, according to the Principles of Catholic Teaching, edited by the parish-priests, *Dr. Rolfus*, of Baden, and *Fr. Pfister*, of Würtemberg, was the outcome and product of these labors.[3] Important services to Catholic popular education were rendered by the Congregation of the *Mechitarists*, founded at Vienna, *for the diffusion of Catholic literature;* by the *Library Association of Bavaria;* but, above all, by the *Association of St. Charles Borromeo*, at Bonn. *Silbert*, of Vienna, a man of fine literary tastes, aided in the same work by his admirable translations of the best ascetical writings, both ancient and modern. Translations of similar works were published and distributed among the people in Bohemia, and

[1] *B. Overberg*, Method of Proper Instruction (1793), 6th ed., Münster, 1825. Hist. of the Old and of the New Testament, 2 vols.; Manual of Religion, 2 vols.; Large and Small Catechism (Complete ed. of Pedagogical Works, Münster, 1825–1833, 6 vols.) Cfr. the Life and Work of *B. Overberg*, Delineated by One of His Relatives, Münster, 1829. *Krabbe*, Life of *Bernard Overberg*, Münster, 1835. *Kellner*, National Education (*Volksschulkunde*), 5th ed., Essen, 1862; Sketches and Portraits drawn from the History of Education, ibid., 1862, 3 vols. German Reader and Instructor (*Deutsches Lese-und Bildungsbuch*), 3d ed., Freiburg, 1864, etc.

[2] *Almanac* for Time and Eternity (since 1843); *Legend* (since 1853); *Greek* (*Spanisches*) to the Educated Classes. *A Visit* to Shem, Cham, and Japhet; St. Elizabeth; The Conflict of My Soul. *Conrad von Bolanden*, Complete Works, People's edition, Ratisbon, 1872.

[3] Mentz, 2d ed., 1872 sq., in 4 vols.

Hosted by Google

at Münster, Aix-la-Chapelle, Ratisbon, Cologne, Schaffhausen, and Mentz, *Ludwig Clarus* (Völk), a convert, being especially distinguished for ease and grace as a translator. Several *poems,* for the most part breathing a true Catholic spirit, were also written; many of the old hymns of the Church cleverly translated; graphic sketches published of those grand old characters of former ages, whose joy it was to walk in the light of God's countenance and to die in the sweetness of His peace; and tales of charming simplicity and winning interest composed for children by men and women whose hearts were as innocent as the hearts of those for whom they wrote. Of these writers it will be sufficient to instance the following: *Frederic Schlegel, Wessenberg, Clement Brentano, Schlosser, Königsfeld, Simrock, Diepenbrock, Ed. von Schenk, von Eichendorf, Jean Bapt. Rousseau, Guido Görres, Count Pocci, Edw. Vogt, Beda Weber, Pius Zingerle, Ladislaus Pyrker, Christopher Schmid, Gallus Morel, Oskar von Redwitz, Father Zeil, Pape, Gedeon von der Heide, Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn, Annette von Droste-Hülshoff,* and *Emily Ringseis.* There were also many able Catholic representatives among the historians of *literature,*[1] *politics,*[2] and *Christian art.* The scope of Catholic literature has been widened by recent works on *ecclesiastical statistics,* for which the Catholic world owes a debt of gratitude to Father Charles of St. Aloysius, Schulte, Neher, and Gams.

The literary and scientific activity, of which we have been giving instances, was largely due to the *Catholic periodical literature of Germany,*[3] to which a powerful impulse was given above fifty years ago by *Frederic Schlegel.* There were many Catholic periodicals, some of course of inferior merit, but the two that have exercised the widest and deepest influence on Catholics and Protestants alike were, first, *The Theological Quarterly of Tübingen,* founded in 1819, which, paticularly while it was partially under the editorial management of *Möhler* (after 1828), gave ample proof that Catholicity, being

[1] By von Eichendorff and Lindemann.

[2] See Vol. I., p. 29, note 3; and Vol. II., p. 865, note 1.

[3] Cf. *The Catholic,* 1843, January nro., pp. 1–17.

Hosted by Google

founded on the unchangeable principles of truth, could hold its own, not only in the practical affairs of life, but against the most searching investigations of science; and, second, *The Catholic*, founded in 1821, which, loyal to its motto, *Christianus mihi nomen, Catholicus cognomen*, stirred up the consciences of Catholics and taught them to set a proper value upon their dignity, at a season when the spirit of indifference was more generally diffused than in any former age; when Catholic doctrine seemed fading or already effaced from the minds of men; and when the negations of Protestantism and rationalistic philosophy appeared to have become everywhere triumphant. Since 1859, *The Catholic*, under the editorial management of *Heinrich* and *Moufang*, has been exclusively devoted to *Catholic science* and ecclesiastical life, its specialty being mediaeval theology. These two periodicals were followed by several others, which may be classified according to their prevalent tone as follows: 1. The *Scientific*, or those whose drift was similar to that of *The Tübingen Quarterly*, including *The New Theological Journal* of Vienna, edited, until 1840, by *Pletz; Hug's Gazette*, in the interest of the clergy of the Archdiocese of Freiburg, founded in 1828; *The Journal of Catholic Theology and Philosophy*, founded in 1833, and edited by the disciples of Hermes; *The Annals of Christian Theology and Philosophy*, founded in 1834, and published at Giessen; *The Theological Journal* of Freiburg, founded in 1839; *The Archives of Theological Literature*, founded in 1842, and published at Munich; *The Catholic Review of Science and Arts*, founded by *Dieringer; The Organ of Christian Art*, edited by *Baudri*, of Cologne; *Church Decoration*, edited by *Laib* and *Schwartz*, of Stuttgart; *The Journal of Canon Law and Pastoral Theology*, edited by *Dr. Seitz; Nature and Revelation*, founded in 1855, with a view to harmonize the study of nature and the dogmas of faith; *The Archives of Catholic Canon Law*, founded in 1857, and edited by *Moy* and *Vering;* and, after some of the above had been discontinued, the following were started in their room: *The Catholic Literary Journal* of Vienna, founded in 1854; *The Literary Guide*, founded in 1862, and edited by *Hülskamp* and *Rump*, of Münster, its aim being to review the literature of Germany and other countries,

Hosted by Google

to give critiques and notices of books and other publications, and to furnish such information concerning literary subjects and literary men as might be acceptable to its readers; *The Literary and Theological Journal of Criticism*, founded in 1866, and edited by *Reusch*, of Bonn, which, in the early days of its existence, counted among its contributors some of the best talent of Germany, but during the Vatican Council drifted into the vagaries of the "Old Catholics;" and the *Historico-political Papers*, founded in 1838, and published at Munich, numbering among its corps of writers many men of great learning and fine mental endowments, who did much to give a Catholic tone to politics, religious life, science, and art; refuted the misrepresentations of Protestant historians; and combated the erroneous political theories of modern times, particularly the perilous doctrines of Liberalism. Works of a similar character appearing in foreign countries were translated and published by *Dr. Huttler*, of Augsburg, in *The Catholic Studies*, founded in 1865, and embracing in the scope of its subjects religion, history, science, art, and social politics.

2. Periodicals having special reference to *pastoral ministrations*, as, for example, *The Monthly Review of Practical Theology*, published at Linz, and which, owing to its *purely practical character*, was eminently popular, there being four editions of it published during the most successful period of its existence; *The Pastoral Archives of Constance;* the *Athanasia*, edited by Benkert; *The Pastor*, edited by Zarbl; *The Archives of Pastoral Conferences* held in the diocese of Augsburg, founded in 1848, and edited by *Merkle*, and the Pastoral Papers of *Munich*, *Cologne*, *Münster*, *Eichstädt*, and *Paderborn*.

3. *Dailies* and *Weeklies*, specially devoted to the interests of the clergy, as, for instance, *The Friend of Religion; Sion; The Catholic Journals* of Frankfort, Passau, and Switzerland; *The Catholic Ecclesiastical Gazette* of Vienna;[1] *The Church Journal* of Silesia; *The South German*, subsequently of Freiburg; *The Rhenish Ecclesiastical Papers*, and those of *Mentz*, *Münster*, *Munich*, Hildesheim, Salzburg, Linz, and other cities. *The Augsburg Post-Gazette* and *several* other papers, Catholic

[1] Edited by *Dr. Sebastian Brunner.*

Hosted by Google

in tone, have sprung up since 1844, of which it will be sufficient to instance *The South German Gazette*; *The Messenger of the People*, published at Munich; *The Journal of Mentz; The People's Magazine*, subsequently called the *Deutschland*, then *The Cologne Gazette*, and now *The People's Gazette; The People's Paper*, published at Stuttgart; *The Westphalia Mercury*; *The Echo of the Present*, published at Aix-la-Chapelle; *The Friend of the People*, published at Vienna; *The Observer*, published at Baden; *The Germania*, published at Berlin; and *The Imperial Gazette*, published at Bonn, beside quite a number of *illustrated* weeklies.

The best productions of the editors of these papers and periodicals were collected and published in the *Ecclesiastical Cyclopaedias* of Wetzer and Wette and of Aschbach, the former issued at *Freiburg* and the latter at *Frankfort*.

§ 420. *Activity of the Catholics of Germany in the Field of Speculative Theology.*

† *Aloysius Schmid*, Activity displayed by Catholics in the Domain of Science, Munich, 1862. Cf. *Chas. Werner*, Hist. of Cath. Theol., pp. 405 sq.

The impulse given to the study of *philosophy* by recent events and the desire to harmonize its principles and deductions with the teachings of faith led to very important results. After it had been found impossible to reconcile the philosophy of either Kant, Fichte, Schelling, or Hegel with the system of Catholic theology, various attempts were made, first by Frederic Schlegel, Molitor,[1] and Baader, and subsequently by other writers, to build up a complete system of Christian philosophy, which, while leaving faith intact, would serve as a weapon of defense to ward off the numerous attacks made upon it. Of those who labored to realize this idea it will be enough to quote the names of *Hermes*, Esser, Elvenich, von Droste, Braun, Achterfeld, and Baltzer, representing one school; and of *Günther*, Papst, Veith, Hock, and Knoodt, representing another. Many of the questions belonging to

[1] *Molitor*, Philosophy of History, or Tradition, Frankfort and Münster, 1828 sq., 3 pts.

Hosted by Google

speculative theology and philosophy were also ably discussed by *Sengler* of Freiburg, Schmitt of Bamberg, Leopold Schmid of Giessen, *Deutinger* of Munich, Volkmuth, Massman, Schenach, *Katzenberger* of Bamberg, *Denzinger* and *Francis Brentano* of Würzburg, Huber, Oischinger, Suing, Uschold, Becker, Kaulich, *Hagemann* of Münster, *Charles Werner*, and others. When *Frohschammer*, a professor at Munich, began to defend philosophical propositions at variance with the teachings of the Catholic faith, *Clemens* and *Stöckl* of Münster, Plassman of Paderborn, von *Schäzler*, *Scheeben*, and other writers for *The Catholic* of Mentz, entered the field against him, and, following in the wake of Father *Kleutgen, S. J.*, of Rome, earnestly advocated a return to the teachings of the Schoolmen, and, in particular, to the theology of St. Thomas and the philosophy of Aristotle. On the other hand, *Michelis*, of Braunsberg, insisted with equal earnestness on the necessity of correctly understanding and properly applying to theology the *original* principles of the philosophy of Plato.[1]

We will here dwell a little in detail upon these *three* movements, because of their importance, and first upon that of which *Hermes*, professor at Münster, and subsequently at Bonn, was the leader.

George Hermes died at Bonn, March 26, 1831. The following words, inscribed on his tomb, unlike most epitaphs, have the merit of being truthful: "From his earliest youth this truly great man sacrificed all the pleasures of life to his thirst for knowledge of sacred things and to his zeal for the Christian religion; and no master of this or any other age has inspired in his pupils feelings of such tender attachment and loyal devotion." And, we may add, never has master guided pupils, whether in their studies or in their daily conduct, with greater wisdom and prudence. Fully believing in his own,

[1] *P. Kleutgen, S. J.*, The Theology of Past Ages, Münster, 1853 sq., 3 vols.; Philosophy of Past Ages, ibid., 1860 sq., 2 vols. Against this: *Michelis*, Observations on the Philosophy of Past Ages, Defended by Father Kleutgen, Freiburg, 1865. The *same*, The Philosophy of Plato in Its Intimate Connection with Revealed Truth, Münster, 1859, 2 pts. *Dr. Becker*, The Philosophical System of Plato in Its Relation to Christian Dogma, taken from quite a different point of view of the subject, Freiburg, 1862.

Hosted by Google

he was impatient and even intolerant of all other systems, and this spirit of exclusiveness interfered with his breadth of view,[1] incapacitating him to judge of the doctrines of the Church as a whole and in their multitudinous relations, and leading both him and his disciples unconsciously to introduce a rationalistic and Pelagian element into their treatment. His system was in consequence condemned at Rome, September 26, 1835, and the *justice*[2] of the judgment was plainly established when Professor *Baltzer*, probably the most vigorous of all his disciples, openly advocated Semi-Rationalism and Semi-Pelagianism in his exposition of Hermesianism.[3] After the publication of the brief of condemnation, the more obstinate of his disciples, refusing to yield, defended themselves, like the *Jansenists* in a former age,[4] by declaring that the doctrines condemned by the Holy Father had not been taught by Hermes, and were not to be found in his writings. Two of the more prominent of these, Professors *Elvenich*, of Breslau, and *Braun*, of Bonn, after some preliminary correspondence with the Holy See, offered to appear personally and prove that their

[1] Cfr. *Esser*, Recollections of George Hermes, Cologne, 1832, pp. 135, 136. Works of Hermes, On the *Intrinsic* Truth of Christianity, Münster, 1805; *Philosophical* Introduction to Catholic Theology, Münster, 1819; *Positive* Introduction, ibid., 1829; *Catholic Dogmatics*, published by *Achterfeld*, Münster, 1831 sq., 3 vols.

[2] *Pro memoria*, in the Affair of Hermesianism, Mentz, 1837. (*Meckel*), The Doctrines of Hermes with Respect to their Condemnation by the Pope, Mentz, 1837. *Berlage*, Introduction to Catholic Dogmatics viewed in the light of the Papal Condemnation of the Doctrine of Hermes, Münster, 1839. A pretty full statement of this controversy is found in *Niedner*, Philosophiae Hermesii Bonnensis novar. rer. in theol. exordii explicatio et existimatio, Lps. 1839. *Niedner* arrives at the following conclusion: "Hermes is far from having strengthened the basis of revelation by his philosophy." The first charge against Hermes (by *Windischmann*) in "*The Catholic*," 1825, October number, p. 1 sq., and, especially, November number, p. 156 sq. The Replies (by *Droste?*) in Smets' Catholic Monthly, spec. ed., Cologne, 1825, Vol. I., p. 81 sq.; Vol. II., p. 101–107. Cfr. *Kreuzhage*, The Connection of the Hermesian System with Christian Science, Münster, 1838, note 1, and *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VII., p. 658 sq. *Myletor*, Hermesianism reviewed from Its Dogmatical Point of View, Ratisbon, 1845.

[3] *Baltzer*, Essay in Aid of an Impartial Judgment on Catholicism and Protestantism, 2d number, pp. 156 and 264 in the notes, Breslau, 1840.

[4] See § 365.

Hosted by Google

statement was correct; but Rome peremptorily declined to enter upon so useless a discussion, broke off all negotiations, and demanded an unqualified submission to the brief of condemnation.[1] Several of the professors at the Seminary of Treves, favorable to the teachings of Hermes, now signified their readiness to cheerfully submit, without qualification, to the decree of the Holy See, and, in consequence, drew up an act of renunciation, which they placed in the hands of their bishop, at the same time forwarding a copy to the Holy Father. To the more loyal of the followers of Hermes this act gave offense, and produced a temporary rupture between the Rhenish clergy and those of Westphalia.

While Hermes gave too great importance to the office of the reason in arriving at the knowledge of revealed truth, Professor *Bautain*, of Strasburg, went to the other extreme, denying the legitimate functions of the human intellect as an instrument of such knowledge. His bishop condemned his teaching as dangerous, and the Holy See fully sustained the decision.[2]

By Professor *Braun*, of Bonn, this judgment was interpreted as an approval of the teachings of Hermes, as if there could be no *via media* between Bautainism and Hermesianism. When Braun and his friends persisted in their errors, a formal complaint was made against them at Rome, and sustained by the Holy See.[3] Bautain and his followers, after some previous discussion at Rome, humbly and unreservedly acquiesced in

[1] *Braun* et *Elvenich*, Acta Romana, Lips. 1838. Cfr. therewith *Htst.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. II., p. 526–543. *Braun* et *Elvenich*, Meletemata theologica, Lps. 1838; German revised edition, "Theologische Studien mit Anmerkungen," Cologne, 1859.

[2] Rapport à Mgr. l'évêque de Strasbourg, sur les écrits de M. l'abbé Bautain, Paris, 1838. *Moehler*, A Letter Missive to M. *Bautain*, in his Complete Works, Vol. II., p. 141–164. Cfr. A Brief Review of M. *Bautain's* Theory (in *The Catholic*, 1835, Vol. 57, p. 125 sq., p. 286 sq.), and many articles in the *Bonn Review*.

[3] † *Braun*, The Tenets of Hermesianism, etc., Bonn, 1835. Laocoön, or Hermes and Perrone, by Daniel Bernhardi (*Braun*), Cologne, 1840. This work in Latin: Laocoon sive Hermesius et Perronius. Latine conversus et variis additamentis auctus, Bonnae, 1842.

Hosted by Google

the judgment of the Holy Father.[1] Professors *Achterfeld* and *Braun*, obstinately refusing to submit to the Papal Brief, condemning the writings of Hermes, were declared by the Coadjutor-Archbishop of Cologne disqualified to hold their chairs in the University, and were accordingly retired by the government, in 1844, but left in the enjoyment of their full salaries.[2] Being sincerely attached to the Church, they could not bring themselves to break openly with her Head, *whom they had ever recognized, both by deed and word, as the true successor to St. Peter.* After having sent them an encyclical letter, pointing out the errors of Hermes, and summoning them in a spirit of paternal kindness to submit to the judgment of the Holy See, which entirely failed of its purpose, Pius IX. renewed the censure passed upon Hermesianism by Gregory XVI.[3]

A similar controversy arose in 1850 concerning *Anthony Günther*, a secular priest of Vienna, and his disciples, who were charged with unduly exaggerating the claims of science and correspondingly ignoring those of the authority of the Church. After an animated controversy, both parties laid the points at issue before the Holy See for decision.[4] By a

[1] *The Catholic*, 1841, Suppl. to February number. *Tübingen Quart.*, 1841, p. 371 sq.

[2] The explanations given by Professors Braun and Achterfeld of the grounds of their refusal to submit to the Pope's decision are found in the *Bonn Review*, new series, year IV., nro. 4, and some articles of *The Catholic* of 1844, nros. 1, 4, and 16.

[3] Cfr. *The Catholic*, 1847, September number. *Bonn Review* of Philos. and Theol., ed. by Achterfeld and Braun, nro. 64.

[4] Arguments for and against Günther, in the *Old* and in the *New Sion;* in the *Augsburg Post-Gazette;* in the *Würzburg Catholic Weekly*. *Mattes*, Günther and His Points of Approach to the New School of Theology (*Tübingen Quart.*, 1844, 3d nro., p. 347–416). *Clemens*, The Speculative Theology of Günther and the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, Cologne, 1853. *Baltzer*, New Theological Letters, addressed to Dr. Anthony Günther, Breslau, 1853, two series. *Knoodt*, Günther and Clemens, Vienna, 1853. *Clemens*, Manifest Opposition of Günther's Speculation to the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, by Professor *Knoodt*, Cologne, 1853. *Oischinger*, The Philosophy of Günther, Schaffhausen, 1852. *Michelis*, The Philosophy of Günther Reviewed, Münster, 1854. *Zukrigl*, Critical Investigation into the Essence of the Rational Spirit and the Psycho-Corporeal Nature of Man, Ratisbon, 1854. *Hitzfelder*, The Latest Discussions on the Speculative Theology of Dr. *A. Günther* and of His School (*Tüb. Quart.*,

Hosted by Google

decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, dated January 8, 1857, Günther's entire works were condemned, and to the great joy of the Holy Father, the humble priest promptly and cheerfully submitted to the decision. He died February 24, 1863. It can not, however, be denied that Günther, like Baader, rendered important services to Catholic science; and being a more skillful and acute dialectician than the latter, he was better able to make a successful stand against Protestant philosophy, the more so in that he was firmly persuaded that the principles underlying his philosophical system were grounded on the unalterable teachings of Catholic theology. Like Hermes he manifested a tendency to a *rationalistic* bias of thought, and, failing to clearly apprehend and set forth the distinction between formalism and realism in logic, he arrived at incorrect conclusions concerning the *Trinity* and erroneous *views on creation*. He also failed to properly appreciate the relation of empiricism to idealism, of faith to science, and of *spirit to matter*, and, by consequence, of the *divine to the human nature in Christ*.[1] To him, however, above all others, in modern times, is due the credit of having revived the study of the science of theology in Austria.

Frohschammer, a professor at Munich, and a prolific writer, advanced some startling propositions on the origin of the soul, advocating the theory of *traducianism*, which he carried

1851, Nro. 1). The *same*, The Theology and Polemics of the partisans of Günther (*Tüb. Quart.*, 1854, Nro. 4). Günther's Reply thereto, in the last volume of *Lydia*, A. D., 1854. Anthony Günther and the Discussions on His Philosophy (by a Catholic Divine), in the *Augsb. Univ. Gazette*, Suppl. to Nros. 105, 106, 107, of 1863. The *American Cyclop.* says: "A. Günther was eminent as a writer on philosophical subjects. But while he combated the views of Hegel and Herbart, and endeavored to reconcile the doctrines of the Catholic Church with the teachings of modern philosophy, he unjustly blamed the Fathers of the Church and the scholastics for having employed pagan conceptions in seeking to impress the truths of religion." All his works, as given above, at p. 889, abstruse as are their contents, were in a Latin translation (by *Flir*), after *nine* years' close examination, placed on the *Index Expurgatorius* (January 8, 1857). *Auctor*, so says the Index at p. 146, *datis literis ad SS. D. N. Pium, P. P. IX. sub die* 10 *Febr.* (1857), *ingenue, religiose ac laudabiliter se subjecit.* (Tr.)

[1] See the Papal Brief, which is found in the work entitled "Pius IX. as Pope and as King," p. 117.

Hosted by Google

to the extreme of *generationism*. He also pleaded in strong and unmistakable language for the complete and absolute separation of philosophy from theology. His writings were condemned by the Holy See December 11, 1862.[1] The writings of two other professors at the University of Munich, *Huber* and *Pichler*, were also condemned; those of the former because their author had advanced certain errors concerning *Scotus Erigena;* and those of the latter, because they contained a defense of the Greek Schism at variance with historical facts and detrimental to the Church of Rome, including strictures on the authority of the *Sacred Congregation of the Index* and the binding force of its decrees.[2] Many theologians, believing that the origin of these errors lay in the abandonment of the old scholastic methods,[3] formed a new school, known as Neo-Scholasticism, and, forgetful of the Catholic maxim—*In dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*—declaimed intemperately against the advocates of modern speculative methods, even going the length of questioning their loyalty to the Church. This conduct was all the more reprehensible, in that the advocates of the new scientific methods had not manifested the least hostility to the Schoolmen; on the contrary, they bore willing witness to their loftiness of thought and their activity, the impulse they had given to the human mind and the services they had rendered to science. Nay, more, *Charles Werner*, one of their number, made a special study of the

[1] *Frohschammer*, On the Origin of the Human Soul, Munich, 1854; Introduction to Philosophy, *ibid.*, 1858; On the Liberty of Science, several articles in the periodical "*Athenaeum;*" On the Rights of Philosophy and Scholasticism, Munich, 1863. Cfr. *Dr. Becker*, The Liberty and the Rights of the New Philosophy, by Frohschammer, reviewed, Spire, 1863; and in *The Catholic* of 1863, Vol. I., p. 385–407; and Vol. II.: "*Frohschammer* and the Apostolic See," three articles. See also *Dr. O. A. Brownson's* Quarterly Review, year 1863.

[2] The Roman Congregation of the Index and Its Powers, Munich, 1863. In an opposite spirit: "Authorization, Objects, and Organs of the Congregation of the Index;" "History of the Congr. of the Index;" "Authority of the S. Congr. of the Index." These three articles have appeared in *The Catholic* of Mentz, 1864, Vol. I. Cfr., especially, *Heymans*, De ecclesiastica librorum aliorumque scriptorum in Belgia prohibitorum disciplina disquisitio, Brux. 1849.

[3] *P. Kleutgen, S. J.*, Theology and Philosophy of Past Ages. Cfr. *Dieringer*, Theology of the Past and of the Present Ages.

Hosted by Google

works of *St. Thomas* and *Suarez*, two of the most eminent of the Schoolmen, giving a wonderfully vivid and truthful picture of their lives, their labors, and their influence. But they did protest against pretensions like those set forth in the work of *Plassmann*,[1] by which an attempt is made to restrict modern science to methods which have been long since given up in the study of theology and philosophy, as if the example of *St. Thomas* himself, who was so tolerant of the opinions of others, were not a solemn warning against a proceeding so unreasonable. To discard modern methods, better adapted to the present development of science, and to again introduce into schools the old peripatetic and scholastic methods, would be even to disregard the injunction contained in the words of St. Matthew, ix. 16. After some desultory skirmishing, directed against the Neo-Scholastics, chiefly by *Mattes*,[2] *Oischinger*, and *Deutinger*, the controversy finally assumed a more definite shape in the hands of Professor *Clemens*,[3] of Münster, and Professor *Kuhn*, of Tübingen, the former the author of a work entitled *Philosophy the Handmaid of Theology* (*Philosophia ancilla theologiae*, 1865), and the latter of another entitled *The Connection between Theology and Philosophy*. Both of the disputants conceded that the real question at issue was to determine what are precisely the relations of the natural to the supernatural order; and while Clemens admitted that philosophy and theology are quite distinct from and *independent* of each other, he still maintained that there is such a thing as a *theological* philosophy, to which divine revelation holds the relation of an *external* authority and rule of guidance. On the other hand, Kuhn maintained that if the integrity of Catholic principles was to be preserved, and the Lutheran

[1] The School of St. Thomas, 5 vols.

[2] *Mattes*, Ancient and Modern Scholasticism (Tübing. Quart. Rev. of Theol., 1844, 1845). *Deutinger*, The Principle of Modern Philosophy and Christian Science, 1857. Cfr. *The Catholic* of 1866, Vol. I., p. 693 sq.

[3] *Clemens*, Our Position in Philosophy (*The Catholic*, new series, year 1859, in two articles). The *same*, De Scholasticorum sententia, philosophiam esse theologiae ancillam, Monasterii, 1865. *Kuhn*, Discussion on Philosophy and Theology, Tübingen, 1860. The *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Concerning a Free Catholic University in Germany, Tübingen, 1863; The Natural and Supernatural, being a Reply to the Charges made by the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*.

Hosted by Google

error, concerning the incapacity of the human mind to acquire any knowledge of truth by its unaided efforts, avoided, it must necessarily be admitted that philosophy, whether in its inception, its development, or its maturity, is wholly the product of the natural powers of the intellect, working independently of the lights of supernatural revelation and the inspiration of positive faith.

After the death of Clemens (at Rome, February 24, 1862), and even during his lifetime, the controversy was taken up by the writers for *The Catholic of Mentz*, and by *Scheeben* and *Dr. Schäzler*, two prominent contributors to *The Historico-political Papers*, who concentrated their energies on determining the precise sense of the term *Supernatural*, or, as it is now written, *Super-nature*, and fixing definitely the import of the ideas conveyed by the words *liberty*, *nature*, *personality*, and *grace*. By Schäzler *grace* was held to be an *endowment*, restoring human nature to its *completeness;* by Kuhn, a gift by which *man is perfected* in his personality.[1]

As days went on the controversy drifted into those interminable subtleties and distinctions, which are to be met with in wearisome reiteration in the quarrels between the Thomists and the Scotists of a former age, and more recently between the Jesuits and Dominicans during the period of Jansenism. The language of the disputants grew vague and shadowy and their reasoning obscure. For the present the faintest hope of a definite solution of the question could not be entertained. In the midst of this confusion and conflict, *A. Schmid*, then a professor at Dillingen, but subsequently at Munich, made an attempt, in which he was less successful than he deserved to be,[2] to harmonize the differences of the two parties and bring about a reconciliation. A second attempt was made by *Döllinger*, *Haneberg*, and *Alzog*,[3] who called a conference of the

[1] *Scheeben*, Nature and Grace, Mentz, 1861. *Von Schäzler*, Natural and Supernatural, being a Criticism of Kuhn's Theology, Mentz, 1866.

[2] For a statement of the scientific tendency and a thorough *examination* of *von Schäzler's* work, see The Theological and Literary Review, ed. by *Reusch*, year 1866, Nros. 18–22.

[3] The Labors of the Scholars' Convention in Munich, from September 28 to October 1, 1863.

Hosted by Google

most learned men of both sides to meet at Munich. The opposing parties being mutually suspicious of each other, little if anything was accomplished. Even the Neo-Scholastics acknowledged, however, that the deputies had the best of intentions, and that, had it not been found necessary to adjourn the conference, it might have rendered important services toward the adjustment of the differences that separated these two schools of thought.[1]

Many attempts have been recently made to harmonize the difficulties arising out of the relations of philosophy to theology, and, in particular, of modern to scholastic philosophy. The way had been made clear for these by *Charles Werner* in his inquiry as to *whether a Christian could exercise full liberty of thought in the study of philosophy, without detriment to Catholic doctrine or turning his back on theology and the Church.*[2]

Schmid and *Wörter*,[3] who had been charged by Schäzler with holding erroneous doctrines, fully vindicated their orthodoxy, and their able and lucid exposition must have convinced their assailant that his imputation was unmerited.

It will be well for the advocates of both schools to bear in mind that the differences between them, if a judgment may be formed from the works already published, are not nearly so great as those that divided the schools of the Middle Ages; and it will be also to their advantage and honor if they mutually give their adversaries credit with being *equally* as loyal as themselves to Mother Church, and equally devoted to the

[1] Cfr. The Convention of Catholic Scholars, in *The Catholic* of 1864, Vol. II., pp. 95–111, and 196–221. This article winds up with the Papal Brief, accompanied with cautions. *Michelis*, Church or Party? A Frank and Open Word to the German Episcopacy, Münster, 1864. *Hergenroether*, Church and No Party, Würzburg, 1865. The Adverse Representation of the Labors of the Scholars' Convention, in the *Civiltà Cattolica;* translated into German under the title The Past and the Present of Theology, Mentz, 1864; was partially refuted by *The Catholic* of 1864, Vol. II., p. 109.

[2] *Werner*, Manner of Coming to an Agreement on the Nature and Object of Christian Philosophy at the Present Epoch, Schaffh. 1867. The *same*, On the Essence and Idea of the Human Soul, 2d ed., Brixen, 1868.

[3] *Schmid*, Science and Authority, with a special reference to Schäzler's works, entitled "New Investigations on the Dogma of Grace and the Nature of Christian Faith," Munich, 1868. *Wörter*, Repulsion of the Latest Attacks against the Present Faculty of Cath. Theology at the Univ. of Freiburg, 1868.

Hosted by Google

true interests of sacred science. Then, like the great theologians of the early and Middle Ages, they will really advance the progress of science, and contribute to the solution of the most difficult problems.

§ 421. *Sects in Germany.*

During the period of the despotic domination of Napoleon and the consequent disorders in the Church, many false mystical sects sprung up in Austria. *Martin Boos* indulged in some fanciful reveries, and taught in vague and incoherent language the Lutheran doctrine of justification *by faith alone.* He was pursued, arrested, cast into prison, and finally expelled the diocese of Linz, but not until after he had perverted many of the clergy and made them his followers. He died pastor of Sayn, near Neuwied, in 1825.

Thomas Pöschl, a native of Bohemia, founded a still more fanatical sect in the same diocese. God and the Blessed Virgin, he and his followers said, appeared to them, commanding them to purify themselves. The process of purification consisted in taking a powder, whose secret powers were potent to drive the devil from their bodies. Napoleon they regarded as the forerunner of Antichrist, and his reign as the inauguration of the millennium. This fanaticism rose to such a degree that in Holy Week of 1817 they immolated a human being. The sect was then suppressed by government in Salzburg, and the fanatical sectaries rendered harmless by being shut up in prison. Pöschl ended his days in 1837 in the hospital for infirm priests at Vienna.

The sect of the *Manhartians*, founded by *Hagleitner*, a priest, had its origin in the *valley of the Brixen*, a portion of Tyrol, belonging to the diocese of Salzburg. These sectaries were the determined and implacable foes of all who had taken the oath of allegiance to Napoleon, particularly if they were priests, who, by so doing, they contended, had incurred equally with the usurper the sentence of excommunication directed against him. Two of their number, *Mangl* and *Mair*, having made a pilgrimage to Rome in 1825, were there disabused of their errors by *Mauro Capellari*, afterward

Hosted by Google

Gregory XVI.,[1] and permitted to again receive the Sacraments; and they in their turn brought back the bulk of their followers. The politico-religious sect of the *Salpetrians*, which sprung up in the south-east part of the Black Forest, in 1764, was in many respects similar to that of the Manhartians. They openly refused obedience to the abbot of the monastery of St. Blaise; defied the authority of the government of Austria, and later on of Baden; and excited the people against *Demeter*, Archbishop of Freiburg, and his clergy, who, they said, were not Roman Catholics. They left off going to church, declined to send their children to school, and, when legally prosecuted, paid the stipulated fine, rather than submit. They appealed to Rome, and some of them went there in person to present their claims, but to no purpose. By 1838 they had nearly, if not quite, disappeared.[2]

An agitation of wider scope and more threatening dimensions was that whose promoters were designated as *enlightened* or *liberal* Catholics, and were subsequently known as *German Catholics*. Influenced by the prevalent tone of Protestant literature and swayed by Protestant principles, by which even good Catholics had become infected, they aimed at subverting the whole economy of the Catholic Church. Priests and laymen, calling themselves *enlightened* and *liberal*, but indiscreet, and possessing little knowledge of the matter in hand, advocated the abolition of the Latin language in the offices of the Church, the simplification of her ceremonies and their adaptation to the spirit of modern times, the abrogation of the rule of celibacy among the clergy, and the establishment of a German national Church, besides a number of other innovations. These views were propagated through the writings of *Wessenberg* and in the pages of *The Annuary of Ulm; The Candid Leaves*, edited by *Pflanz; The Catholic Leaves*, edited by *Fischer;* and *The Canonical Guardian*, edited by *Alexander Müller* and his colleagues, *Carové, Fridolin Huber, Reichlin-*

[1] *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. IX., p. 829 sq., s. v. "*Schwärmerei;*" Fr. tr., Vol. 8, p. 365. *Ginzel* (Austrian Quarterly, 1867); Essay of a Hist. of Religious Fanaticism, Martin *Boos*, etc.

[2] †*Dr. Hansjacob*, The Salpetrians Examined and Exposed, 1st and 2d enlarged ed., Waldshut, 1867.

Hosted by Google

Meldegg, *Schreiber*, and others, most of whom had long since interiorly apostatized, and were only restrained by interested motives from breaking altogether with the Catholic Church.[1] These reformers were particularly active in the Grand Duchy of Baden, in Würtemburg and Switzerland, and, for a season, in the territory of Treves and in Saxony; and the *Theiner* brothers imported the new ideas into Silesia.[2] *Augustine Theiner*, the younger of these, after an extended trip through England and France, settled at Rome, where he renounced his former errors, and by his historical works rendered an important service to Catholic literature. He died at Cività Vecchia, August 9, 1874.[3] *Fischer*, a Catholic priest and pro-

[1] "Why the '*Liberals*' still Remain within the Fold of the Catholic Church" (*Bonn Review*, Nro. 1, p. 190); *Philalethes* (Bp. Reisach), "What have we to Expect from the Reformers of Offenbach and of Saint-Gall?" being a Dialogue between a Parish-Priest and his Parishioners, Mentz, 1835. Cfr. "Reform of the Church," in *The Catholic* of 1833, January number, p. 84 sq., and "The Catholic Church and the Reformers," 1841, January, February, April, July, October, and November numbers, and *The South German Eccl. Journal*, 1841, Nro. 34.

[2] (Jno. Anth. *Theiner*), The Catholic Church in Silesia, Altenburg, 1826; assisted by his brother: The Forced Celibacy of the Catholic Priests, Altenburg, 1828, 3 vols. Cfr. *Braun*, On the Writings of Professor *Anthony Theiner*, Bonn, 1829. Dr. *Franke*, Sketch of a Great Reformer, where *Anth. Theiner* is delineated from the point of view of his science and of his life, Glatz, 1845.

[3] *Aug. Theiner*, De Pseudo-Isidoriana canonum collectione, Wratislaviae, 1827. Hist. of Clerical Seminaries, Mentz, 1835. Lettere storico-critiche intorno alle "Cinque Piaghe della Santa Chiesa" del Chiarissimo D. Antonio Rosmini Serbati, 1848; Latin tr., Naples, 1849. As keeper of the secret archives of the Vatican (fr. 1851), he issued various compilations illustrating the eccl. hist. of nearly all the different Christian nations, viz., Sweden and Her Relation to the Holy See; Latest Situation of the Cath. Church in Poland and Russia; Hist. of the Conversion of the Reigning Houses of Brunswick and Saxony to the Cath. Church; Hungaria sacra; Monuments historiques de Russie, 1859, 2 T., f. Continuation of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius, 3 vols., fol., 1856 sq.; Codex Diplomaticus Dominii temporalis Sanctae Sedis, 6 vols., fol., Rome, 1861–1863; Smaller work, in answer to Passaglia's appeal to the Italian bishops, 1864. In 1869 he entered into a correspondence with Dr. Doellinger and Prof. Friedrich, and was barred all access to the archives. In 1874 Theiner visited Austria to make arrangements for publishing his *Acta genuina SS. oecum. Conc. Trid.*, etc., Zagrabiae, 1874, 2 T., 4to, a work of questionable accuracy and fidelity; also his *Hist. of Clement XIV.*, written in answer to Crétineau-Joly's Hist. of the Suppression of the Jesuits (2 vols., Lps. and Paris, 1853), led to a long and bitter pamphlet controversy. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

fessor of *moral* theology at Lucerne, pursued quite a different course. Not content with taking a wife, he had the indelicacy, when one of his children died, to invite his friends to the funeral. In the present age the import of such conduct can not be mistaken, and men guilty of it must in time, if not at once, cut themselves off from the Church. Though they may call themselves Catholics, they are such only in *name*. Being destitute of all religious conviction, it is impossible for them to openly profess for any length of time doctrines which they secretly deny. And their position will be rendered all the more difficult in the measure in which Catholic faith grows more living and energetic, religious literature more Catholic in tone, and the faithful become more ardently attached to the teachings and laws of the Church. This will be particularly the case at a time when it is the tendency of political events to separate persons of different religious creeds by sharp lines of demarcation. Such has been, in matter of fact, the history of these liberal Catholics. They remained in the Church as long as they could, and when a formal separation became imperative, they sought only a decent pretext. This was soon supplied. *John Ronge*, a suspended Silesian priest, professed to be shocked at the honors paid to the Holy Coat[1] at Treves, which was exhibited to the faithful in the cathedral of that city during a pilgrimage, lasting from the 18th of August to the 6th of October, 1844; and in a letter addressed to Mgr. *Arnoldi*, the bishop († January 9, 1864), he publicly denounced the whole affair as shameless idolatry. His next act was to issue a call to the "German Catholics" to secede from Rome. The writers for the Liberal and Protestant press of Saxony and Silesia, feigning to believe his impious slanders, grew vir-

[1] *Marx*, Prof. of Ch. H., Hist. of the Holy Coat, Treves, 1844. *J. von Goerres*, The Pilgrimage to Treves, Ratisbon, 1845. Against *Gildemeister's* and *Sybel's* pamphlet, entitled "The Holy Coat of Treves and the Twenty Other Seamless Coats." *Clemens* published "The Holy Coat of Treves and Protestant Criticism," Coblentz, 1845; and "The Holy Coat of Treves and No Other, or The Censorious Tailors of Bonn," by a Pilgrim of Coblentz, Coblentz, 1845. *Dr. Hansen*, District Physician of Treves, Report and Official Documents Relative to the Miraculous Cures Wrought during the Exhibition of the Holy Coat of Treves, in 1844, Treves, 1845.

Hosted by Google

tuously indignant. Their inveterate hatred of Catholicity again broke forth, and found expression in vituperative and fiery denunciations of the Pope, whom they designated as the tyrant of consciences and the shame of Germany. Catholic priests were derided and insulted; the obsolete and savage polemics of a by-gone age was revived; false confessions of faith and ludicrous forms of abjuration, which Catholics had a hundred times indignantly disclaimed, were again sent forth to the world as genuine Catholic documents; and all manner of untruthful reports were set afloat concerning bishops. By such cruel and dishonest methods of warfare, pursued with a consistency and a patience that lent to misrepresentation and falsehood the color of truth and honesty, were many laymen and priests finally prevailed upon to separate themselves from the Catholic Church.[1] Ronge, a man wholly destitute of theological knowledge, and whose life bore not the slightest token of a religious mind, was thus led on by force of circumstances to play the part of a reformer, and, much to his own surprise and possibly to his amusement, was hailed as *another Luther*, whose memory would be held in benediction by future generations. Assuming with simulated gravity the character of a reformer, he organized a religious community at Breslau, rejecting all but *two of the Sacraments*, and even these he so diluted and explained away that they ceased to have either meaning or import. The "friends of enlightenment," as those who had been slapping Ronge on the back and cheering him on delighted to be called, were not a little astonished to see themselves left far away behind in the race of radicalism by their precocious neophyte. Ronge, of course, had imitators. *Czerski*, a priest, having disregarded his vows of celibacy and given public scandal, was condemned by his superiors to undergo a punishment, which, considering the offense, was extremely light. He, however, refused to submit, and, desiring to give color of legality to his course,

[1] *Baltzer*, Liberty of the Press and Censorship, with Regard to the Pilgrimage of Treves, Breslau, 1845. *Christ*, Examination of the Latest Reform Sermons and and anti-Catholic Literature, Ratisbon, 1845. The Industrial Exposition of Berlin and the Exposition of the Holy Coat of Treves. Letter of a Berlin *Protestant*, Münster, 1845.

Hosted by Google

became the founder of a new community of sectaries at Schneidemühl, in the Grand Duchy of Posen. Although these were thoroughly *Protestant* in principle and doctrine, especially concerning the Sacraments, they had the effrontery to call themselves *Catholics*.[1] Nevertheless, at the so-called *Council of Leipsig*, March 22, 1845, *Czerski* put his signature to a formulary of faith, which, from a Christian point of view, is absolute nihilism.[2] Such was the origin of the sect which presumptuously arrogated to itself the title of "*German Catholic*," and even called itself the "*Christian Catholic and Apostolic Church*." *Ullmann*, himself a Protestant, has very justly remarked that the founders of this sect had nothing in common with Catholicity, as portrayed in history, and had therefore no shadow of right to call themselves "*Catholics*."[3] True Catholics were very naturally indignant at the assumption, but their indignation was still further intensified when governments, with a keen appreciation of the insult conveyed in the title, styled these arrogant sectaries "*Dissenting Catholics*."

Actuated by motives of long-cherished hostility to the Catholic religion, the Prussian government permitted these apostles of impiety and enemies of Christianity to go up and down freely through the kingdom, everywhere misrepresenting by word and writing the Catholic Church, her doctrines and her institutions, and reviling and deriding Catholics, notwithstanding the fact that the rights of the latter had been most solemnly guaranteed, and they themselves promised immunity from insult and outrage. But the Berlin government soon learned that its anticipations were incorrect and its hopes groundless. The sectaries did indeed succeed in gaining over a few Catholics, who were such only in *name and appearance*,

[1] Analysis of the "Confession of Schneidemühl," Posen (Dec.), 1844. Open Letter to Czerski, by a Roman Catholic Priest, once his Schoolmate, Posen, 1845. Open Letter to Roman Catholics on the Justification of Czerski, by *Jurek*, Lissa, 1845.

[2] *Leipsig Symbol:* I believe in God the Father, who, by His omnipotent word, created the world, and governs in truth, in justice, and in love. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Christian Church, holy and universal; in the remission of sin and life everlasting. Amen.

[3] *Ullmann*, My Misgivings as to the German Catholic Movement (*Theological Studies* and *Criticisms*, year 1845, Nro. IV.)

Hosted by Google

but they did incomparably greater harm to *Protestantism*, out of which their principles sprung, and to which they were therefore *naturally allied.* Protestant free-thinkers, or the "friends of enlightenment," encouraged by the attitude of the government toward the sectaries, boldly demanded for themselves the freedom that had been so cheerfully granted to apostate Catholics.[1] "*The schism*," said Protestant theologians, "*has sunk deeper into the Protestant than into the Catholic Church.*"[2] The agitation was at first, to all appearances, a purely religious one; but it was not long until a revolutionary and communistic element was imported into it by one *Dowiat.* The principles that had been applied to religion were now applied to *politics*, and it soon became evident that they tended to unsettle the foundations of the throne, as well as those of the altar. *Gervinus*,[3] who had witnessed the early efforts of sectaries with satisfaction, and had contributed not a little to their success, now frankly avowed that the underlying principles of this insidious movement were *political*, and not theological, and that it was driven forward by appeals to the passions of the people. Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, and Austria had already made a stand against the movement, and Prussia, now waking to a sense of her own danger, began to take severe measures against the so-called "Dissenting Catholics." Strange to say, they never made but *one* convert of eminent ability and sincere piety to their opinions, and never published a theological periodical adequately meeting even the most moderate demands of science. The nearest approach to such a publication was the *Catholic Church Reform* (monthly) of Berlin, which was suspended after a short existence. The tone of its articles was a verification of the words of *Lessing*, in one of his letters, written in 1769. "Don't speak to me," said he, "of your freedom of thought and speech at Berlin. There is no freedom there except that of putting on sale the insults any one may choose to fling at religion, and every

[1] "The Protestants," said Ronge, in a letter, "come to us because they desire liberty; and yet they experience only oppression and tyranny from governments."

[2] *Köhler* and *Klopsch*, Repertory of Ch. H., Glogau, 1845, p. 345.

[3] Mission of the German Catholics, Heidelberg, 1845.

Hosted by Google

honest man should blush to make use of such freedom." John Ronge, during the remainder of his restless life, continued to propagate his errors, and made many ineffectual attempts to organize communities in different cities and towns. On the 7th of May, 1872, he was fined and cast into prison at Frankfort, when he was informed by the "German Catholics" of that city that his services would be dispensed with for the future, and that he would do well to seek some other field of labor.

While these events were a severe trial to Catholics, whether priests or laymen, they also furnished an occasion for the publication of a variety of works, in which the more majestic and deeper views of Catholicity, hitherto to be found only in writings designed for the learned, were given to the world in a popular form and in language at once easily intelligible and attractive. The effect was instantaneous and consoling. The teachings of the Church became better known, and, as a consequence, more appreciated and loved; and those who had been hitherto hesitating in belief, and indifferent in practice, put aside all indecision, and grew firm in their faith and strict in their observance. The leaders of the various scattered communities of "German Catholics" are still busily at work in devising a *religion of the future*, adequate to the wants of *pure and regenerate humanity*. Of course their efforts have all been disastrous failures, but they draw a melancholy consolation from the congenial labor of giving currency to obsolete

[1] *Staudenmaier*, The Nature of the Catholic Church, being a Reply to Her Adversaries, Freiburg, 1845. *Idem*, On the Religious Peace of the Future, Freiburg, 1846, 3 pts. *Hirscher*, Study on the Great Religious Questions of the Day, Dedicated to the Higher and Middle Classes, together with an Examination into the Motion of Deputy *Zittel*, relative to the Equality of Seceding Dissenters before the Law, Freiburg, 1846. *Scharpff*, Catholicism and Rationalism, Tübingen, 1845. *Von Linde*, Reflections on the Recent Ecclesiastical Events, considered in their Relations to Right and Policy, Mentz, 1845. *Idem*, Church Establishment, Liberty of Conscience, and Religious Associations, *ibid.*, 1845. *Sporschil*, Practical Difficulties of any Attempt at Establishing an Apostolic and Catholic Denomination in Germany, and two other works, by the same, Lps. 1845. *Peter* and *Paul*, Being a Monthly in the Interest of the Catholic Church, amidst the Troubles of the Day, ed. by Dr. *Hast*, of Berlin, and the *Collection of Seasonable Writings* in Defense of the Catholic Church, and chiefly the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. 15–18, years 1845, 1846.

Hosted by Google

prejudices against the Catholic Church and to imputations as false as they are cruel and injurious.

§ 422. *The Catholic Church in Russia and Poland.*

For Literature, cf. § 410.

The depressed condition of the Church in Russia is in melancholy contrast with the revival of Catholic life in the various countries whose history we have been reviewing. Notwithstanding that a comparatively liberal Constitution had been granted under *Alexander II.*, the persecution of the Catholic Church in Russia and Poland, which had been begun under the Emperor Nicholas, by a strange anomaly, was not abated, but intensified.[1]

After the celebration of the tenth centenary of the foundation of the Empire, in 1862, when a splendid fac-simile edition of *Tischendorf's Codex Sinaiticus*,[2] containing the most ancient and best authenticated Greek text of the Bible, was published, and after the suppression of the insurrection in Poland, in 1863, the persecution grew more violent and systematic.[3] It was the design to extirpate at a blow both the religion and the nationality of Poland, for the religious and patriotic feelings of the Poles are so closely interwoven as to be practically inseparable. The gallant struggle of this heroic people to maintain their national existence failed either to elicit the admiration or excite the pity of their brutal conquerors. Their patriotic aspirations were literally extinguished in blood. Priests and monks, when not shot or strangled, were carried away into desolate Siberia. On the 28th of November, 1864, one hundred and four monasteries were abolished, and their inmates, surprised and seized the evening before,

[1] *Baron A. v. Haxthausen*, The Constitution of Russia and the Laws of 1861, Leipsig, 1866.

[2] This is the photo-lithographical fac-simile edition of the whole Sinaitic Bible, published at the expense of the Emperor of Russia, in 4 vols. (3 for the Old and 1 for the N. T.; the latter is 148 folios), under the title Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. Auspiciis augustissimi imp. Alex. II., ed. Const. Tischendorf, Petropoli, 1862. A copy of this rare edition is in the Astor Library of New York. (Tr.)

[3] *Montalembert*, l'Insurrection Polonaise, Paris, 1863.

Hosted by Google

forcibly hurried away into distant exile. The banished Catholic priests were replaced by Greek popes, and Catholics themselves compelled by barbarous enactments and cruel tortures to conform to the Ruthuenian Liturgy, and have their children baptized by schismatical priests, whom they abhorred. The Augsburg Universal Gazette, speaking of these events, in an issue of recent date,[1] says: "In the district of Siedlec the peasants still refuse to take part in divine services celebrated by Russian priests. They meet clandestinely on Sundays for private devotions, and conceal their children, to keep them out of the way of the popes. The Russian magistrates endeavor to win over the refractory peasants by the arts of persuasion. They arrest the leaders and cast them into prison, but again set them at liberty when they see the peasants organizing and preparing to resort to violent measures for the liberation of the prisoners."

In the hope of making the Church entirely subservient to the Civil Power, the Tzar, by confiscating ecclesiastical property, deprived her ministers of all means of independent support, and allowed them instead a salary from the government. *Pius IX.* protested vehemently against these violent measures,[2] but to no purpose. The Russian embassador even went the length of insulting the Pope in his own apartments, when offering him the congratulations of the season on New Year's Day of 1866, and the Holy Father was forced, in self-defense, to order the vulgar representative of the northern barbarian out of his presence. Diplomatic relations between the cabinet of St. Petersburg and the Holy See were immediately broken off, and the violence of the persecution against the Catholics of Russia and Poland still further increased. Bishop *Dupanloup* gave expression to the sorrow and indignation

[1] Augsb. Univ. Gaz., No. 265, of September 22, 1867, p. 4217.

[2] The Roman official document of 1842, comprising ninety articles of proof, issued under Pope Gregory XVI., was followed by a further complaint of Pius IX. at Christmas, 1866, 368 pages, 4to: Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del sommo Pontefice Pio IX., a riparo dei mali che soffre la chiesa cattolica nei dominii di Russia e di Polonia. In January, 1878, Cardinal *Simeoni* published a Memorandum, signed by *Pius IX.*, exposing the treachery of Russian diplomacy. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

which these cruel proceedings inspired in every generous bosom in his report of the Centenary of SS. Peter and Paul at Rome.[1] "At a time," said he, "when five hundred bishops are gathered about the common Father of Christendom, representing the nations of the world, there is *one* country dear to us above all others by its sufferings, its fidelity, and its heroism, *whose chief pastors are absent*. O, dear Church of Poland! in vain have we sought for but a single one of thy bishops, that we might kiss his hands as we would those of a martyr's, but none was to be found. Alas, oh Poland, when will they cease to tear the bleeding from the bosom of thy Mother and ours?"

Since 1872 there have been indications, though very slight ones, that some satisfactory understanding may be arrived at between Rome and St. Petersburg.[2]

[1] The Late Festivals of Rome, tr. fr. the French into Germ., by Dr. *Rütjes*, Essen, 1867, p. 14.

[2] We subjoin here the hierarchical organization of the Russian "*Orthodox Church*," directed by the "*Holy Synod*." Metropolitan Sees: 1. *Kiev* and Halicz; 2. Novgorod and *St. Petersburg;* 3. *Moscow* and Kolomna; 4. *Kasan* and Sviajsk; 5. *Astrachan* and Enotaïevsk; 6. *Tobolsk* and West Siberia; 7. Jaroslav and *Rostow;* 8. *Pskov*, Livonia, and Courland; 9. *Riazan* and Saraisk; 10. *Tver*, with the seat at Kaschin; 11. *Cherson*; 12. *Sebastopol;* 13. *Tchernigov* and Niechin; 14. *Minsk* and Bobrousk; 15. Podolia and Braislav, with the seat at *Kamieniec;* 16. *Kishenev* and Chotim: 17. White Russia and *Lithuania;* 18. *Vladimir* and Susdal; 19. *Vologda* and Ustjuk. Episcopal Sees: 1. *Jrkutsk* and East Siberia; 2. *Mohilev* and Mstislav; *Olonetsk* and Petrozavodsk; 4. *Novo Tcherkask* and Georgievski; 5. *Ekaterinoslav;* 6. *Smolensk* and Dogorobousch; 7. *Nishnei Novgorod* and Arsamas; 8. *Kursk* and Bielgorod; 9. *Polotsk;* 10. *Tula* and Bielev; 11. *Viätka* and Slobodskoi; 12. *Archangelsk* and Kholmogori; 13. *Voronesh* and Zadonski; 14. *Kostroma* and Galitch; 15. *Tambov* and Chatsk; 16. *Orel* and Sievsk; 17. *Poltava* and Pereuislav; 18. Volhynia and *Zitomir;* 19. *Perm* and Ekaterinburg; 20. *Kharkov* and Ucraine; 21. *Ostrog;* 22. *Pinsk;* 23. *Tomsk;* 24. *Wilna;* 25. *Vitebsk*; 26. *Warsaw*. Total, forty-five eparchies or dioceses. There are, moreover, ten vicariates erected in provinces with a preponderating Catholic or Protestant population. The Russian prelates, from the reign of Catharine II. (1764), have been divided into *three* classes, answering to the military grades of *general-in-chief*, *lieutenant-general*, and *major-general*. Their tenure is at the pleasure of the Tzar. Those of the first rank receive an annual salary of 1,500, those of the second 1,200, and those of the third 1,000 rubles; the prelates are also allowed money for the table, for six horses for their consistories (5—7 members), their numerous cathedral clergy, officials, and menial servants. The secular clergy, from the color of their liturgical vestments, are designated as the *white*, whilst

Hosted by Google

§ 423. *The Missions of the Catholic Church.*

Choix de Lettres édifiantes et curieuses jusqu' à 1808, continuées jusqu' en 1820 dans les Nouvelles Lettres édifiantes, auxquelles se lient les Annales de la propagation de la foi (from 1822), Germ., Cologne, 1834 sq.; and *Einsiedeln*, Synopsis of the History and Statistics of Catholic Missions during the first forty years of this century are given in the *Univers*, September 13, 1839. Cfr. *Sion*, October of 1839, and January of 1840; September, Nro. 113; November, Nro. 142, Supplem. New Synopsis in the volumes of the *Propagation of the Faith*, 1857, Nro. IV., p. 57 sq. Father *Charles of Saint Aloysius*, The Catholic Church in Her Actual Extension over the Earth, Ratisbon, 1845. * *P. Wittmann*, Beauty of the Church in Her Missions, etc. * *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 595–759, with documents. † *Henrion*, Catholic Missions, Vol. IV., pp. 703–802. † *Hahn*, Hist. of Catholic Missions from the Times of Jesus Christ down to our Own Day, Cologne, 1858. † *Margraf*, The Church and Slavery from the Discovery of America, Tübingen, 1865. *Kalkar*, History of the Roman Catholic Missions, in Danish; Germ. ed., in collaboration with the author, edited by *Michelsen*. Erlangen, 1867. *R. von Wedell*, Hist. and Geogr. Atlas, Nro. VI., map 34. *W. J. Kip*, "Jesuit Missions in North America," New York, 1846. *De Smet*, Oregon Missions, 1847. *Huc*, Christianity in China, Tartary, and Thibet, 2 vols, London, 1853. *T. G. Shea*, Hist. of Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the U. S., New York, 1855. Relations des Jésuites, 3 vols., Quebec, 1858. *T. W. M. Marshall*, Christian Missions, Their Agents and Their Results, 2 vols., London and Brussels, 1862; New York, 1864. *J. Neher*, Eccl. Geogr. and Statistics, 3 vols., Ratisbon, 1864–1868. *Grundemann*, Missionary Atlas, Gotha, 1867–1871. *Catholic Missions* (an illustrated monthly), Freiburg and St. Louis, 1873 sq.

Obedient to the injunction of Our Lord to preach the Gospel to all nations and to every creature, the Catholic Church has in all ages sent her missionaries into every part of the habitable globe.[1] Since the rise of Protestantism, and notably since the defection of the great maritime powers from the Church, two classes of missionaries have unhappily come face to face in nearly every country of the world, mutually opposed to each other, and the one not unfrequently undoing the work of the other. But, in the face of every obstacle, the Catholic religion has gone steadily forward, gaining triumph after triumph, until at last there is not a corner of the earth in which its teachings are not proclaimed and professed. In the present century the glorious field of missionary work, in

the monks are styled the *black clergy*. See *Jacob Neher*, Eccl. Geogr., Vol. II., pp. 416–426. (Tr.)

[1] A Few Words on the Missions of the Catholic Church, *Tübingen Quart. Review*, 1825.

Hosted by Google

which the great *St. Francis Xavier* was first to labor in modern times, has been cultivated with encouraging success.

The Missions may be conveniently distributed into the following five geographical divisions:

I. The *Eastern Missions*, comprising the Crimean Peninsula, the Grecian Archipelago, Constantinople, Syria, Armenia, Persia, Arabia, Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia.

II. The *India Missions*, extending as far as the Philippine Islands.

III. The *Missions of China*, including Siam, Cochin-China, Tung-King, and Japan.

IV. The *American Missions*, which, starting at Hudson's Bay, include the Canadas, British America, the Indian Territory, the country along the Rocky Mountains, and the Antilles, ending at Paraguay.

V. The *Missions of Oceanica*, including Australia.

These missions, though under the direction of the *Propaganda* at Rome, are mainly supported by the *Society for the Propagation of the Faith*, founded at Lyons in 1822; by the *Association of the Holy Childhood of Jesus*, founded at Paris in 1844; by the *Leopoldine Association* of Austria; by the *Association of* (King) *Louis* of Bavaria; and by the St. *Francis Xavier Association*, in the archdiocese of Cologne. There is also a number of institutions in the Roman Catholic Church *specially devoted to the work of training missionaries*, as, for example, the College of the *Propaganda* at Rome, the most famous missionary establishment in the world; *Saint-Lazare*, or the *Seminary for Foreign Missions*, and the *Seminary of St. Esprit*, at *Paris;* the Seminary of the *Marists at Lyons;* the College of *All Hallows*, near *Dublin*, Ireland; *St. Joseph's College* at *Mill Hill*, near *London*, England, exclusively devoted to missionary work among the negroes; the *Chinese College* at *Naples;* the Seminary for the Missions of *Central Africa* at *Verona;* besides other missionary colleges in Alsace and Lorraine, at Milan, Louvain, and near Brussels. Moreover, the Religious Orders, as a rule, train some of their members for foreign missionary work, and many of them have special houses set apart for the purpose. Many dioceses and vicariates-apostolic in Pagan lands are given in charge by the Propaganda to the

Hosted by Google

various Religious Orders, on the understanding that they are to supply them with a number of priests adequate to the necessities of the missions. The Orders most numerously represented in the foreign missions are the Jesuits, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, the Lazarists, the Picpus Society, the Marists, the Capuchins, and the Carmelites. There are also seminaries, like that of *Penang* in British Asia, established in purely missionary countries, for the education of such of the natives as desire to devote themselves to the work of evangelizing their countrymen. The progress of the far-away missions is given in the *Annuario Pontificio*, now called the *Gerarchia Cattolica*, from which we learn that new bishoprics and apostolic vicariates are annually established in them.[1]

I. EASTERN MISSIONS.

In the new Kingdom of *Greece*, where there are ten or twelve schismatical bishops and three bishops and two priests recognizing the authority of the *Permanent Holy Synod* of Russia, introduced July 23, 1833,[2] there is already one Roman Catholic archbishop at *Naxos*, together with five bishops residing respectively at *Andros*, *Skio*, *Syra*, *Tinos*, and *Santorin*.[3] There is also an archiepiscopal see at *Athens*. The total number of Catholics in these bishoprics is about 30,000. *Mgr. Aloysius Maria Blancis*, Bishop of Syra, is the Apostolic Legate, and is recognized by the government as such. New churches have been recently built at Athens, Piraeus, Hiracli, Patras, and Navarino.

The *Catholic* Church is spread over the *whole* of European, Asiatic, and African *Turkey*, where she has *sixty-six episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, eleven vicariates, and two apostolic prefectures*. Of these, eleven episcopal and two archiepiscopal sees are situated in European Turkey. It is estimated that there are about 900,000 Catholics in European and Asiatic Turkey; 260,000 in the former, and 640,000 in the latter provinces, all of whom have been bitterly persecuted.

There is a *patriarch* in *Constantinople*, and eight episcopal sees and five apostolic vicariates in Bulgaria,[4] Walachia, Moldavia, Serbia, Macedonia, Albania,

[1] Cf. *American Cyclopaedia*, art. Missions (Foreign). (Tr.)

[2] Cf. *Schmitt*, Hist. of the Modern Greek and Russian Church, pp. 178 sq.; *Hefele*, Supplement to Ch. Hist., Vol. I., pp. 439, 443.

[3] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, year 1877, pp. 34 and 41. (Tr.)

[4] On the 18th of December, 1860, two hundred Bulgarian notables petitioned Mgr. *Brunoni*, the Pope's Delegate at Constantinople, for their nation's readmission to the Catholic Church. On the 21st of January, 1861, Pius IX. expressed the excess of his joy over this auspicious event. But schism, heresy, and Islamism conspired against the Church of God, and prevented the consummation of the act; many Bulgarian villages, however, with their priests, remained steadfast in their professions of union with Rome. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

Bosnia, and Herzegovina, where, in spite of the crafty opposition of the Greek Schismatics, the brutal violence of the Mussulman, and the intrigues of the Russians, much progress has been made by the combined effort of the Lazarists, Minorites, Capuchins, Italian Passionists, and Sisters of Charity.[1]

The *United Armenians*, besides a special patriarch, residing at Bsommar, on Mount Libanus, have also a primate archbishop at Constantinople, who, after the conclusion of the Peace of Adrianople, September 14, 1829, was honored with the dignity of the patriarchal office. On the 11th of July, 1830, Archbishop Nurigian, who had been consecrated at Rome, received the pallium from *Pius VIII.* New bishoprics were established for the Catholic Armenians by *Gregory XVI.* in 1832, and by *Pius IX.* in 1854. Pius IX.[2] found it necessary to reprehend the conduct of some of the clergy, who, under the pretext of promoting Catholic unity, thwarted the efforts of the Holy See to maintain the old Armenian Rite, and conformed to that of the Schismatics. They also advocated the abolition of certain usages, which had been lawfully introduced, and had a special significance, in that they showed the detestation of the Catholic Armenians for schism and their attachment to Catholic unity.

When the Armenian bishops failed to come to the Vatican Council, and it became known that they were secretly agitating against unity at home, Pius IX. appointed Mgr. *Hassun* Patriarch, who, after a fruitless attempt to have his authority recognized by the Armenians of Turkey, except those of Constantinople, who are obedient to the Holy See, returned to Rome in July, 1872.

Abdul Medshid, on his accession to power, yielding to the representations of the European Cabinets, promised, in an official document, dated November 3, 1839, to ameliorate the condition of the Christians; but his good intentions were rendered nugatory by the fanaticism of the Turks. By the *Hatti-Humayum*, or Edict of Toleration, issued in 1856, at the close of the war against Russia, the Sultan granted to the Chistians equal rights with his Moslem subjects, including the right to bear arms and to appear on equal terms in the courts of justice; but, in matter of fact, the Christians were no better off than they had been before the Edict was issued, as is abundantly established by the fact that a frightful massacre of the Christians took place on Mt. Libanus in July, 1860,[3] and in Bulgaria in 1876. The self-sacrificing devotion of the Sisters of Charity in caring for the soldiers wounded in the war of 1855 against Russia, elicited even at Constantinople a sympathetic admiration for their heroism. It was hoped that the visit of the Sultan to the World's Fair at *Paris*, in 1867, and subsequently to the Courts of *London* and *Vienna*, and his conference with the King of Prussia, at Coblentz, would enlarge his views and expand his sympathies, and that the result of these influences would be visible in the civilization of Turkey and the more humane treatment of his Christian subjects. If these blessings are ever to come upon Turkey, they will be due mainly to the great labors of the Lazarists, the Sisters of Charity, and the Christian Brothers, who have opened *schools* all over the country. The main hope of the

[1] *Augsb. Univ. Gaz.*, February 21, 1843. *Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. XI., pp. 331 sq.; Fr. tr., Vol. 24, pp. 249 sq. *Gams*, Vol. I., p. 183 sq.

[2] Cfr. Pius IX. as Pope and King, Vienna, 1865, pp. 177–180.

[3] Cf. *Pitzipios-Bey*, L'Orient, les réformes byzantines, Paris, 1853.

Hosted by Google

Christians for an improved condition of affairs lies in the desire of the Turks to have their children properly educated, and in the ability of the former to give such education.

But it is in *Asiatic Turkey*,[1] and particularly in the Levant, or that stretch of sea-coast lying along the Mediterranean from Constantinople to Alexandria, that the Lazarists, under the protection of Austria and France, have put forth their greatest energies and gained their most splendid triumphs. The Catholic Church has a special interest in these countries, for their memories are associated in her history with some of her most cherished traditions.[2] Here, too, the schools are her chief instrument of influence, and in conducting them the Jesuits and Franciscans emulate the zeal and labors of the Lazarists. While the Capuchins were erecting schools in the apostolic vicariate of *Aleppo*, and the Sisters of Charity achieving their usual success at *Smyrna*, the Jesuits were setting up new missions in Syria.[3] Veneration for the sacred places, hallowed by scenes in the life of Our Lord and His Apostles, was revived by pilgrimages to the cradle of Christianity, which were encouraged and aided by the French and Austrian governments, and rendered more practicable by the foundation at Jerusalem of a Hospice for Pilgrims, the creation of the munificent generosity of the Imperial House of Hapsburg. In Egypt and Syria, where heretofore the Franciscan convents connected with the Custody of the Holy Sepulcher could barely manage to subsist, there are now numerous religious houses and institutions, amply supported by the contributions that pour in from all parts of the world.[4] Educational establishments were opened by the Capuchins in *Egypt* and *Abyssinia*, after these countries had been detached from the apostolic vicariate of *Aleppo*, the former in 1837 and the latter in 1843. Thus is the way being noiselessly and gradually prepared for a return of the schismatical sects of the East to the Roman Catholic Church, to which they are indebted for all that dignified and ennobled their history in the past. "It can not be denied," says *Dr. Durbin*, an American and a Protestant, "that the high degree of civilization formerly reached by these countries was wholly due to their union with the Catholic Church."[5] At present the most ardent advocates for union with Rome are the patriarch of the *Maronites*, the patriarch of the *Melchite Greeks*, the patriarch of the *Syrians*, the patriarch of the *Armenians* in Cilicia and Mesopotamia, and the patriarch of the *Chaldeans*. The condition of the Island of Cyprus, which once possessed three hundred churches, and has now only four thousand Catholics, is by no means encouraging.

---

[1] **Freiburg* Eccl. Cyclopaed., Vol. XI., pp. 334–339; Vol. XII., pp. 66–74; Fr. trans., Vol. XXIV., pp. 25 sq.; Vol. II., pp. 50–59. *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 595–644.

[2] *Scholz*, A Journey between Alexandria, and Syria, Lps. 1822, p. 203.

[3] Father *Charles* of *Saint Aloysius*, l. c., pp. 72–103.

[4] At *Cologne* there was formed, on June 30, 1855, the *Association of the Holy Sepulcher*, in furtherance of the Catholic interests in the Holy Land. It has published, without interruption, since 1857, a Journal under the Title "*The Holy Land*."

[5] Observations in the East, by *John P. Durbin*, Vol. II., pp. 287, 527.

Hosted by Google

While the Catholic missions of Palestine, poor in the wealth of the world, but rich in the zeal and love of God, are accomplishing such great things, the *Anglo-Prussian episcopal see of St. James* of Jerusalem,[1] with an endowment of 120,000 gilders a year, does not possess a single parish. The general look of contentment and ease, which strike every one as characteristic of the household of the bishop and the attachés of the mission, and which are in such striking contrast with the squalor and poverty of the population, in whose spiritual interests the members of this expensive establishment are supposed to be working, leaves the reluctant impression upon the minds even of Protestants that the whole enterprise is a sort of "religious luxury."

In *Persia* the Catholic missionaries, and notably the *French Lazarists*, are active and zealous, and, by the purity of their lives and their disregard of worldly wealth and conveniences, have gained the respect and extorted the admiration even of the disciples of Mohammed; while, on the other hand, the American Protestant missionaries, supplied from Boston with almost unlimited amounts of money, which they lavishly distribute among the inhabitants, have made comparatively small progress.[2] In 1834 the Shah of Persia issued a firman, securing Father *Deuberia*, Superior of the Armenian Mission, against molestation or vexatious interference.[3]

A College for Foreign Missions has been erected in Western Persia, with funds supplied from Lyons, by *Eugene Boré*, who has been instrumental in bringing many other blessings upon the country. Through the influence of France, the Catholics of Persia have had many of their churches restored. There is a small but faithful community of Catholics at *Kerak*, not far from the Dead Sea, in Arabia, for whom a church sufficiently large for their accommodation was built in 1848.

II. INDIA MISSIONS.

In *East India*[4] the first bishopric was established at *Goa* in 1534, and raised to an archbishopric in 1557, with *Cochin*, *Cranganore*, and *Meliapoor* in Hither India, *Malacca* in the Malay Peninsula, and *Macao* in China, as suffragan sees. The controversy between the Jesuits and Dominicans relative to the *Malabar Customs*, which was decided adversely to the former by the Papal Legate, Tournon, in 1704, and again by Pope Benedict XIV., July 21, 1742, interrupted the harmonious relations previously existing between these two great Orders; and the subsequent suppression of the Society of Jesus, while it was not without some retarding influence upon the missions under its charge, did not perceptibly stay their progress. From the year 1673 onwards *John de Britto*, a son of the Viceroy of Brazil, and his companions followed in the footsteps of Francis Xavier, and, like him, were endowed with the gift of miracles. *Francis Lainez*, during an apostolate of above thirty years, converted more than fifty thousand idolators. The Indian missions continued in a flourishing condition

[1] Cf. *Hefele*, Supplem. of Ch. H., Vol. I., p. 477; Dr. *Braun*, Jerusalem, 2d ed., p. 215, Freiburg, 1867.

[2] *Marshall*, Christian Missions, Vol. II., p. 121. (Tr.)

[3] *Hoenighaus*, Cath. Eccl. Gaz., Nro. 80, and the text of the Letter, Nro. 88.

[4] *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 608; *Müllbauer*, The Catholic Missions in East India.

Hosted by Google

until 1760, when they ceased to exist, in consequence of the removal of the Jesuits by the government of Portugal. After the power of Portugal had declined and the English Company had established its authority in East India, Popes *Alexander VII.* and *Innocent XII.* sent thither apostolic vicars, and an apostolic vicariate was permanently fixed at *Bombay.* Thereupon the officers of the East India Company, by an order of the 7th of August, 1791, forbade the Archbishop of Goa to exercise any authority over the Catholics of Bombay. The sees of Cranganore, Cochin, and Meliapoor, situated within the territory occupied by the Company, after falling vacant, were not again filled, because Portugal, having the right of presentation, would not exercise it now, that the country was in the hands of the English. In 1832 the Holy See warned the Court of Lisbon that the appointments must be made or the privilege *formally* abdicated, and receiving no answer, established (1834–'37), with the concurrence of the English government, apostolic vicariates at *Calcutta, Madras, Madura,* and on the island of *Ceylon.* The Chapter of Goa protested against the action of the Holy See, forbade any one, under pain of excommunication, to hold intercourse with the Apostolic Delegate, and encouraged the priests of Goa to oppose the missionaries who remained obedient to Rome, thus creating a schism, which *Joseph de Sylva y Torrès,* nominated by the Chapter in 1843, and upon the most solemn pledges of keeping the peace, confirmed by Gregory XVI. Archbishop of Goa, was to perpetuate. A facile instrument in the hands of the schismatical clergy, and a vehement advocate of the claims of the Court of Lisbon, the new archbishop at once conferred priests' orders on eight hundred illiterate men, who went up and down through the vicariates with the diabolical purpose of doing all the mischief they could, and really succeeded in driving about 240,000 Catholics into schism. After a protracted negotiation with the Cabinet of Lisbon, Pius IX. finally had Sylva y Torrès called home from Goa. But, in total disregard of the Pope's Allocution of February 17, 1851, Anthony Maria Suarez, styling himself Vicar General of the Archbishop of Goa, at Bombay, encouraged by de Matta, Bishop of Macao, did his best to perpetuate the schism. For resisting the attempts of the latter, *Anastasius Hartmann,* Vicar Apostolic of Patna and Administrator of Bombay, was forced to take refuge in a church from the fury of the schismatics, where, being shut up from the 13th to the 20th of March, 1853, he nearly died of starvation. And when Pius IX., on the 8th of the following May, threatened the unworthy Bishop of Macao with the censures of the Church, the outcry against Rome in the Portuguese Chamber grew so violent that the Papal Nuncio was on the point of quitting the country. The negotiations between Rome and the Court of Lisbon, relative to the Goa schism, were brought to a satisfactory close in 1859.

Besides the episcopal sees in the ecclesiastical province of *Goa* (viz., *Cochin, Meliapoor,* and *Malacca*), there are numerous apostolic vicariates in India, viz: In *Hither India,* those of *Agra, Bombay,*—divided into two districts, *Northern* and *Southern,*—*Mangalore, Mysore, Coimbatoor, Verapoli, Quilon, Colombo, Jafnanapatam, Madura, Pondichery, Madras, Hyderabad, Vizagapatam, Patna, Western* and *Eastern Bengal,* with residences respectively at Calcutta and Dacca, and the apostolic prefecture of *Central Bengal.* In *Farther India,* those of *Eastern, Northern,* and *Southern Burmah;* and in the island of Java, a

Hosted by Google

dependency of Holland, that of *Batavia*. The suppression of the Jesuits, the schism of Goa, and the revolt against the English in 1857, all contributed, at different times and each in its own way, to retard, without, however, wholly obstructing the spread of Catholicity in these missionary lands. Had not the Jesuits been suppressed, it is probable, as a Protestant writer tells us,[1] that they would have succeeded in converting, not only the whole of India, but China also; and even after these missions had been abandoned for above fifty years (1760 to 1820), the missionaries, who returned at the end of that time, were astonished to find more than a million, or, including the schismatics of Goa, *over twelve hundred thousand* still fervently attached to the faith that had been preached to their fathers. And not only has the Church held her own in these lands. It is shown by statistical reports that the churches founded by St. Francis Xavier and his successors receive some thousands of converts annually. In 1859 five thousand schismatics were reconciled to the Church, and nine hundred idolators and Protestants converted in the vicariate of Madura alone, and in 1875 the total number of conversions in the eighteen vicariates of Hither India was above ten thousand.[2] There were in 1859 forty-three Jesuits in these missions, a number of colleges and schools for educating priests and training catechists, five orphanages, three hospitals, besides convents of Carmelite and Franciscan nuns.

III. MISSIONS OF CHINA AND THE ADJACENT TERRITORIES.

In *Farther India*, including Burmah, Siam, Annam, together with Tungking, Cochin-China, etc., the apostolic vicariates of *Pegue* and *Ava*, which had been established in 1744 for the Empire of *Burmah*, had been long vacant and the missions long deserted for lack of laborers, when *Pius VII.* came to the pontifical throne. A new vicar was appointed by him, and the mission given in charge to the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary at Turin. In 1848 there were 4,000 Christians in the mission of Burmah out of a population of 9,000,000. The apostolic vicariate of West Siam, to which portions of that of Pegue and Ava have been annexed, has been quite recently established. For many years *Pallegoix*, Apostolic Vicar and Bishop of Mallos, labored zealously in the Kingdom of Siam, and, after great efforts to overcome the aversion of the natives to Christianity, finally succeeded in converting about 7,000 of them. In the mission of *East-Siam* there is a seminary, situated at *Bangkok*, in which young men are educated for the priesthood. In 1854 there were thirty seminarists in this institution. There are also several primary schools in the mission, besides four convents of females, belonging to the Congregation of the Servants of the Mother of God, who are wholly devoted to the work of instructing children and catechumens of their own sex.

In *Annam* and *Cochin-China* the missions are more promising, notwithstanding the fact that, after the accession of *Min-Menh*, in 1820, the Christians there passed through one of the most ferocious persecutions ever waged in any age or country. During the twenty years that this persecution lasted they displayed

[1] Mr. George Campbell, quoted by *Marshall*, Christian Missions, Vol. I., pp. 245 sq. (TR.)

[2] *Catholic Missions*, Freiburg, 1877, p. 68. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

all the heroism of the early martyrs of the Church, and their numbers steadily increased until it reached one hundred thousand. The Christian world learned of these events with feelings of mingled joy and sorrow from an allocution, published by Gregory XVI. on the 27th of April, 1840.

During the short reign of *Tieu-Tri* († 1847) the violence of the persecution somewhat abated, owing mainly to the fear inspired by the thunders of English cannon along the coast of China and to the success of the French naval commander, Lapierre, who, in the space of an hour, utterly annihilated the fleet of Cochin-China.

The persecutions were renewed under his successor, *Tu-duc*. In 1850 the Christian inhabitants of the village of Ly-tou-pa, numbering two hundred and forty, were inhumanly tortured because they would not consent to give up their faith. In 1851 Father *Duchos* died in prison; Father *Augustine Schaeffler*, a French priest from Nancy, was beheaded in the same year; and Father *Bonnard* on the 1st of May of the following year. Above 9,500 Christians were carried off by the cholera in 1851, but their loss was more than compensated by fresh accessions.

Unfortunately, the appearance of a French man-of-war outside the harbor of *Turon*, in 1857, had the effect of making the King of *Annam* suspicious of his Christian subjects, whose lot grew daily more intolerable, until finally, after the departure of the vessel, a general persecution broke out against them in 1858. There was hardly a habitation that had sheltered a Christian left standing, and schools, seminaries, convents, and houses of religious were all destroyed. Still the missionaries held their ground, and, after the storm had gone by, again began work. Thanks to their courage, zeal, and activity, numbers of adults are being now daily baptized. According to the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith,[1] there were in *Annam*, in 1858, in spite of the martyrdoms, fourteen bishops, besides above thirty in China Proper, sixty European and two hundred and forty native priests, sixteen hundred native female religious, and five hundred and thirty thousand Christians.

In *Tibet*, Horatio della Penna was partially successful in evangelizing the natives. In 1744, when he and his brethren were expelled the country, they passed over into the Empire of the Great Mogul of India. The apostolic vicariate of Tibet and Gyra was established in 1808, and placed under the direction of the Capuchins. In the years 1845 and 1846 the Lazarists *Huc* and *Gabet* penetrated into Tibet as far as Lassa, where they made many converts, but were subsequently ordered to quit the country, in consequence of a demand made to the Tibetan authorities by the resident embassador of China. Another attempt was made in 1851 and 1852 to enter the country from the Indian side of the Himalayah mountains, but the courageous missionaries were seized and put to death before they had succeeded in making any conversions.

When *Joseph Maria Chauveau* was appointed apostolic vicar for Tibet, in September, 1864, a fresh persecution broke out against the Christians, during which many died for their faith.

[1] No. 119.

Hosted by Google

In *China Proper*[1] the condition of the Christians varied with the opinions of the reigning monarch. Towards the close of the reign of *Keen-lung* (1735–1795) the missionaries were taken into favor; during the early days of the reign of his successor, *Kea-king* (1795–1820), they were agitated with alternate hopes and misgivings; but, as time went on, the Emperor, yielding to the solicitations of the mandarins, began a violent persecution against the Christians. According to the testimony of *Gützlaff*, a Protestant missionary, who died in 1851, "thousands of Catholics perished by the axe of the executioner." The persecution was at its worst in 1815, when the apostolic vicar, *Dufresse*, after forty years (1776–1815) of fruitful missionary work, died the death of a martyr and a saint, September 14, 1815. In an allocution of September 23 of the following year, Pius VII. took occasion to speak of him in terms of the highest praise.

Father *Clet*, a Lazarist, at the advanced age of seventy-two, and Father *Chen*, a native of China, together with a number of laymen, like Dufresse, suffered martyrdom, confessing their faith. Apart from some vexatious annoyances from the mandarins, the Christians enjoyed a season of comparative quiet during the reign of *Taou-Kwang*, from 1820 till 1850. In 1839, however, the French missionary *Perboyre*, after having seen five Christians beheaded before his eyes, was subjected to the most inhuman torments, and finally put to death in the province of Hoo-pih. His three brothers, who had remained at home, being also desirous of winning the crown of martyrdom, set out for China, after having received the news of their brother's death. While these events were taking place, the first Anglo-Chinese Opium war broke out, resulting, in 1842, in the *Treaty of Nanking*, by which the "Son of Heaven" bound himself to pay to the "Red-whiskered Barbarians," as he called the English, a war indemnity of $21,000,000, and to open, besides the port of Canton, those of Amoy, Fuh-chow-Foo, Ning-po, and Shanghai to foreign trade.

On the joint demand of France and the United States, a promise was given that native Christians should not be molested; that foreigners should be allowed to build churches and chapels in five of the sea-port cities; and that missionaries in the interior, if seized, should be delivered up to the nearest French Consul. This was a virtual abdication of the Chinese principle of exclusion. On the accession of *Heen-fung*, February 5, 1850, the old Chinese party again rallied, and urged upon the new Emperor the necessity of setting aside the Treaty of Nanking and of assuming an aggressive attitude toward foreigners. After a long succession of intrigues, secretly carried on against the English, open hostilities finally broke out in Canton in October, 1856. As the Chinese had also broke faith with France by the murder of Père *Chapdelaine* in the same year, the latter country at once united with England in demanding satisfaction. Canton was stormed, and yielded, after a feeble resistance, in 1857; and the allied forces, ascending the rivers in light boats, penetrated into the interior of the country. The Emperor was forced to conclude a treaty of peace, the articles of which are thus described by Baron Gros, the French Plenipotentiary, writing to his government, under date of July 19, 1858. "The

[1] *Gams*, Vol. I., pp. 196 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 41, Pen-pictures and Sketches of China, five articles; cf., especially, pp. 1049 sq.

Hosted by Google

vast Empire of China," said he, "is open to Christianity, and nearly the whole of it to the industry and commerce of the West. Our diplomatic agents will reside, as occasion may require, at Peking, and *our missionaries have leave to go all over the Empire.* A Chinese embassador will be sent to Paris, and the laws against the Christians will be abrogated." This treaty, though fenced about with every sort of diplomatic formality, was not carried into execution, and, in consequence, France and England again, in December, 1859, began hostilities, which resulted in the capture of *Peking* and the signing of the Treaty of Tien-tsin, October 24, 1860. It was stipulated that the articles of the Treaty of 1858 should be enforced; that certain other concessions, besides those there provided for, should be granted to the Christians; that a war indemnity of 8,000,000 of taels should be paid to the allied powers; and that some valuable privileges should be accorded to France. The Catholics, besides having a cathedral and four churches restored to them at *Peking*, were permitted to build another at *Canton*, the corner-stone of which was brought from Jerusalem. The tyrannical and voluptuous *Heen-fung* died shortly after the conclusion of the Treaty, in the summer of the following year, leaving the throne to his son *Tung-che*, then only five years of age. Tung-che having died without issue, January 12, 1875, the succession passed from the direct line of the Tsing dynasty. His cousin, then not quite four years of age, was chosen in his room, under the title of Kwang-seu or "Succession of Glory."[1] The government was temporarily vested in two women of singular moderation and prudence. Still persecutions did not entirely cease in the provinces, but the instances that occurred were the work of officials, and had not either the sanction or the sympathy of the government. Quite the contrary. In 1862 a high official was dismissed because he had been implicated in the murder of Abbé *Néel*, a missionary in Kwei-Chow, and his four lay assistants, on the 17th of February. The Chinese general, Tien-ta-jen, a disreputable character, who subsequently fell into disgrace, affecting to regard as rebels the numerous disciples of the Abbé Néel, whom his bishop, Mgr. *Faurie*, called a saint, instigated the mandarin, Tay-loutche, to put them to death. During each successive year since 1850, Europeans and natives, priests and laymen, men and women, have cheerfully offered their lives in witness of the truth of their faith. Of the native priests, Andrew Koung, Superior of the College of Hoo-pih, perished in 1852; Father Philip Minh, in 1853; Father Huong, in 1856; and Father Paul Tinh and another, in 1857. On the 31st of January of the last-named year, remarkable for the great number of martyrs it gave to the Church, four Christians were beheaded; on the day following eleven; and two days later ten; all in the same town. The executions continued during the following months of April and May, and on the 20th of July, Bishop *Diaz*, a Spaniard, was beheaded, after a long and fruitful career as a missionary. His head was recovered in 1858 by some fishermen, and brought to Bishop *Melchior*, who was himself shortly to undergo a still more terrible fate, being literally hacked to pieces. From the days of Ricci to the present, the history of Catholicity in China has been one of persecution, fidelity, and martyrdom.

There are at present twenty-two apostolic vicariates in China Proper, viz:

[1] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, London and Philadelphia, 1877, art. China. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Kwang-tung, Fuh-Keen, Che-Keang, Kiang-su, Northern, Eastern, and *Southeastern Chili, Hoo-nan, Northern, Eastern, Western,* and *Southwestern Hoo-pich, Nan-king, Keang-se, Kwang-se, Yun-nan, Kwei-chow, Northern, Southern, Eastern,* and *Western Sze-chuen,* and *Hong-Kong.* There are also three apostolic prefectures, viz: *Hai-nan, Kwang-tung,* and *Kwang-se.* There are many apostolic vicariates in the neighboring territories. To the South, in *Indo-China* or *Farther India*, the following: *Eastern* and *Western Siam, Camboja, Western, Eastern,* and *Northern Annam* or *Cochin-China,* and *Central, Southern,* and *Western Tung-king;* and to the North, *Corea, Japan, Manchooria, Mongolia, Tibet,* and, finally, the apostolic prefecture of the *French Colonies* in East India. There were in the whole of the Celestial Empire, in 1859, 196 European priests and 428 of native birth, besides eighteen Catholic seminaries. In the year 1868 there were in China Proper 158 European and 169 Chinese priests, and a Catholic population of 325,000; but, including the dependencies, of more than a million.[1] Through the instrumentality of the "*Society of the Holy Childhood,*" 359,388 Chinese children received the grace of Baptism up to 1857, of whom 9,168 had been purchased; in 1875, 300,000 foundlings were baptized, 50,000 of whom survived and were brought up.

The comparatively unknown Peninsula of *Corea,* into which Catholic missionaries had penetrated as early as 1632, and where they have been laboring ever since, forms in itself an isolated apostolic vicariate. There is no country of the world in which the Church has had as many martyrs in modern times as in this. *Alexis Houng the Young,* suspected of favoring a policy which would open the country to missionaries, was put to death, May 21, 1801, after having borne up under frightful tortures, his last words being: "I die for the religion of the Lord of Heaven." Being almost entirely destitute of priests, the Coreans made a most piteous appeal to Pope Pius VII. and the bishops of the Catholic world to come to their relief. "We beg of you," they said, "in virtue of the merits of our martyrs, to send us priests at once; we make the request with tears of blood in our eyes." In Corea a persecution broke out simultaneously with that of China. In the interval between April and December, 1839, Bishop *Imbert,* his two brothers, and above a hundred native Christians of both sexes, suffered martyrdom; and in the short space of forty years three hundred martyrs died, confessing the faith, in the Peninsula.

After the persecution had ceased, the Christians enjoyed a few years of comparative quiet, and in 1859 there were 16,000 Catholics in the country. A fresh persecution broke out in 1866, in the course of which Bishop *Verneux,* his coadjutor, and many priests were martyred.

From the year 1596 the Catholics of Japan passed through a half a century of almost uninterrupted persecution, in the course of which they endured tortures, to which for refined, malignant, and inhuman cruelty, those borne by the early martyrs of the Church can not be compared. Such was the feeling of distrust entertained by the Japanese for Europeans, after this persecution, that nearly the whole country was closed against them. The Dutch alone, impelled by lust of gain, purchased on the most humiliating terms the privilege of remaining in the country and keeping possession of their manufacturing estab-

[1] Cf. The *Madras Catholic Almanac* of 1868 and the *Gerarchia Cattolica,* Rome, 1877. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

lishments on the island of Desima, near the city of *Nangasaki*. It was not until after the naval expedition, sent out by the United States in 1858, had taught the Japanese a lesson, that the government of the Mikado consented to conclude a treaty with that country, which was followed by others with England and the continental nations, opening the great city of Nangasaki and the smaller towns of Simoda and Hokadadi to foreigners. A Catholic church was erected in 1862 at Yokahama by *Gérard*, the apostolic prefect. It is hoped that the recent visit of the Japanese Embassy to the great cities of North America and the capitals of Europe will have the effect of inspiring a more generous policy towards the Christians of the Island-Empire, which is now an apostolic vicariate.

It would seem that after so long an eclipse, a new light has dawned upon AFRICA, once the nursery of great Doctors of the Church. The new see of Algiers received its first incumbent, Mgr. *Dupuch*, January 5, 1839, but the first considerable progress was reported by his successor, Mgr. *Pavy*, in 1854. Gregory XVI. paid a very fitting and delicate tribute to the revived African Church, and one, too, well calculated to awaken the memories of its past greatness, when he presented its first bishop, Mgr. Dupuch, with a valuable relic of St. Augustine, which was translated from Toulon to Hippo, on the 24th of October, 1842, by seven bishops, with unusual pomp and ceremony, and deposited in a church of the city, in which the great African Doctor shut himself up to die, with the shouts of the barbarian invaders of his country ringing in his ears. In 1867, during the incumbency of Mgr. *Lavigerie*, *Algiers*, at the request of Napoleon III., was raised to the rank of an archbishopric, with *Oran* and *Constantine* as suffragan sees. The bishopric of *Ceuta* has been established for Fez and Morocco, containing about 14,000 Catholics, of whom 8,000 reside in the episcopal city. The recent victories of the Spaniards have had the effect of materially improving their condition. In *Tunis*, where there are at present 3,000 Catholics, an apostolic prefecture was established in 1634 by Urban VIII., which was raised to the rank of an apostolic vicariate by Gregory XVI., March 21, 1843, with Fidelis Sutter, a Capuchin, as incumbent.

Egypt and *Arabia*, formerly attached to the Custody of the Holy Land, were erected into a separate apostolic vicariate in 1837, with the seat at Alexandria. *Perpetuus Guasco*, a Franciscan, was the first incumbent. The *Franciscans*, of whom there are about seventy in these missions, have convents at Cairo, Rosetta, Damietta, Fayoom, Alexandria, and other cities, and through their zeal many Coptic Christians have been reconciled to the Holy See. The Catholic population of the vicariate is in the neighborhood of 15,000, of whom 7,000 reside at Alexandria, and religious institutions are comparatively numerous and are daily on the increase. The Franciscans are assisted in their labors by the *Lazarists*, the *Sisters of Charity*, and the *Sisters of the Good Shepherd*. These devoted women have the direction of schools, workhouses, and houses of refuge, and, owing to the epidemics with which the country is so frequently visited, at times endure extreme privation.

Abyssinia, which constituted an apostolic prefecture until 1847, when it was raised to the rank of an apostolic vicariate, contains a number of flourishing missions, mainly due to the zeal of the Lazarists and to the protection of France. *Justinus de Jacobis*, a man eminent for piety and learning, was ap-

Hosted by Google

pointed the first vicar, and from this time forth many native priests asked to be received into the Church. Since the incursion of the *Gallas*, in the sixteenth century, the ancient Empire of Abyssinia, though temporarily united in recent times during the reign of the unfortunate Emperor *Theodorus*, has been split up into the three virtually independent kingdoms of Amhara, Tigré, and Shoa. The schismatical Abyssinians would long since have entered the Church, if not deterred by their *Abuna* or Metropolitan, and forcibly prevented by the Moslems. There are prosperous missions, in spite of adverse circumstances, at *Keren* and *Massowah*. In 1859, *Ubyé*, King of Tigré, dispatched an Embassy to Rome to make his submission to the Holy See, and, in consequence, above 10,000 Abyssinians, including many eminent ecclesiastics, abjured their schism, and yielded obedience to the Church. Among the *Gallas* and *Sidamas*, where the Capuchins are laboring earnestly, missionary stations have been established at Kafa, Guera, Gammara, and Borro, Bishop *Massaia* received the abjuration of *Teclafa* and of more than a thousand monks, over whom he ruled, and penetrated into the country as far as Sennaar and even beyond it. He consecrated a coadjutor in 1859.

Our knowledge of *Central Africa* has been largely increased in recent times through the well-known labors of Dr. *Livingston*, Captain *Speke*, Lieutenant *Cameron*, Mr. *Stanley*, Mr. *Barth*, Mr. *Schweinfurth*, and other German, English, American, and French explorers and scientists. The fidelity, courage, and endurance of these men are worthy of all praise, and the large stores of information contributed by them to the solution of the various questions concerning Africa can hardly be overestimated. But the motives that prompt missionaries to enter the country are still higher and nobler. They go there, not to gain the praise and applause of the world, nor even, primarily at least, to add to the stock of human knowledge, though they have done much in this field also, but to preach the Gospel and gain souls to Christ.

Gregory XVI., on the 3d of April, 1846, shortly before his death, established an apostolic vicariate for Central Africa, according to a plan suggested by *Max Ryllo*, a Polish Jesuit. After having labored as a missionary in Syria, and served for a time as Rector of the College of the Propaganda at Rome, Ryllo, accompanied by a brother of the Society of Jesus and four secular priests, among whom was *Dr. Knoblecher*, a native of Laibach, penetrated, in 1847, into the hitherto unknown districts of Central Africa. On the 11th of February, 1848, the band of missionaries arrived at Khartoom, the modern capital of Nubia, situated at the confluence of the White and Blue Nile, and of easy access from Europe, and resolved to make this place the seat of the new vicariate. After the death of Father Ryllo, June 17, 1849, Dr. Knoblecher, who was named his successor, unaided by the Propaganda, explored the territory along the White Nile, in search of available missionary stations, and in 1850 hastened back to Europe to obtain priests and material aid to enable him to carry out his designs. The Imperial Court of Austria took up his project with zeal, and the *St. Mary's Society*, presided over by the aulic counsellor, *Dr. Hurter*, was founded in the interest of the new enterprise. Accompanied by five German priests, and in the most sanguine frame of mind, the pro-vicar, having returned to Khartoom, explored, on board his own vessel, the *Stella Matutina*, the White Nile as far as Gondokoro, in search of a site for a missionary station among the

Hosted by Google

Baggahri. This was finally fixed at *Heiligenkreuz*, where many new missionaries shortly arrived from Germany, but their number was soon reduced by death. More than twenty fell victims to the insidious effects of the climate, and Dr. Knoblecher died at Naples, April 13, 1858. He was succeeded by *Dr. Kirchner*, of the diocese of Bamberg, who, desirous of locating the mission in a more healthy district, fixed upon the village of *Shellal*, near Assuan, on the confines of Egypt and Nubia. With a view to providing for the mission a sufficient and unfailing number of missionaries, he had it transferred by the Propaganda, in 1861, to the *Franciscans.* Rheinthaler, O. S. F., the new pro-vicar, with thirty-two members of his Order, took charge of the missions, but fell a victim to his zeal in 1862.

By 1865 the bulk of these Franciscans had likewise perished, and it was found necessary to give up the stations, with the exception of Khartoom, where two Fathers and one Brother remained. More than forty missionaries had been cut off by disease, even before they had acquired a sufficient familiarity with the language of the country to enable them to make themselves useful. But, if they accomplished little permanent good for religion during their short stay in Central Africa, they made very valuable contributions to science. The names of Knoblecher, Duryak, Beltrame, Morlang, Vinco, Kaufmann, Kirchner, Gossner, and Mosgan will ever find a place among the most eminent of African explorers; and their voyages of discovery, their accurate geographical researches, their meteorological observations, and their ethnographical and linguistic studies, have added vastly to the stock of knowledge concerning the Nile regions and their inhabitants. Although ten years elapsed before another pro-vicar was appointed to the African missions, they did not become wholly extinct. In 1854 two institutions were founded at Naples by Ludovico di Casoria, the one for boys and the other for girls, where children were brought at proper age from Khartoom to be educated and again sent back to labor for the salvation of their countrymen and women. In 1865 sixty negro boys and one hundred negro girls were sent to the house of the Propaganda at Shellal, to be distributed according to the needs of the missions.

In 1872 Don *Comboni* was appointed pro-vicar. He began work on a new plan. Seeing the paramount necessity of acclimatizing those who were to work in the missions of Central Africa, he founded a seminary at *Verona* for the education of priests and a novitiate for the training of Sisters. From this place they passed over to Fostat, in the neighborhood of *Cairo*, where they assumed the direction of schools, and after a sufficient time spent there went to the interior. The first of these devoted bands, under the guidance of *Don Carcereri*, settled at *El Obeid*, the capital of Kordofan, in 1872. In 1873 Comboni conducted from Europe to Khartoom a colony of forty persons, eighteen of whom were Sisters of St. Joseph, all native Africans and Asiatics. In 1874 Comboni divided his vicariate into two districts, Northern and Southern, and in 1875 intrusted the former, including the provinces of *Berber*, in Upper Nubia; *Suakin*, on the shores of the Red Sea; and *Taka*, on the northern frontier of Abyssinia, to the *Camillists;* while he kept the latter, including the former Kingdom of *Dongola*, for himself. He was consecrated bishop in 1877, and appointed vicar apostolic of Central Africa.[1]

[1] *Freiburg Cath. Eccl. Gazette*, 1858, pp. 154 sq. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol.

Hosted by Google

Although the *Cape of Good Hope* had been rounded by the Portuguese in the fifteenth century, it was not colonized until the seventeenth, when the *Dutch Boers* settled there. They were followed by some French Huguenots, and Calvinism became the prevailing religion of the Colony. In 1806 Cape Colony passed under British rule, and shortly afterward Catholic missionaries began to find their way into it. Previously to 1847 the Church there was under the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of Mauritius or Isle de France, but in that year an apostolic vicariate was established, its first incumbent being Mgr. *Griffith*, who took up his residence at *Grahamstown*. The number of Catholics increased so rapidly that it was found necessary in 1851 to divide the Colony into *two districts, Eastern* and *Western;* and in 1874 to establish the *Apostolic Prefecture of Central Capeland*, with the seat at *Georgetown*, which embraced a portion of what was formerly the Western District. St. Aidan's College, under the direction of the Society of Jesus, was opened at Grahamstown on the 31st of January, 1876.[1]

Little, if any, progress has been made in the missions of *Guinea, Senegambia*, and *Madagascar*. Of seventy-five missionaries, belonging to the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, sent to the Guinea missions within an interval of eleven years, forty-two either died prematurely or were rendered unfit for service by sickness. It became apparent that the only hope of achieving permanent success lay in the education of native priests, and, in consequence, a seminary was founded for this purpose at Lyons in 1854. An apostolic vicariate was established for Senegambia in the same year; and on the 28th of August, 1860, another was established for *Sierra Leone*, and a third for *Dahomey*, the seat of the latter being at *Agbomey*. *Guinea*, *Natal*, and *Madagascar* have each an apostolic vicariate; and Tripoli, Senegal, Saharra, the Islands of Annobon, Corisco, Fernando Po in the Bight of Biafra, Congo, Central Capeland, Nossibé, Ste. Marie, Mayotte and Comorro Islands, and Zanzibar, have each an apostolic prefecture.[2]

IV. AMERICAN MISSIONS.

The Church in America is full of life and activity, and is daily gaining fresh triumphs. In spite of the reverses sustained in the last century, her growth has been rapid and steady. On this Continent there are 177 bishoprics, 15 apostolic vicariates, and 4 apostolic prefectures, the Catholic population being about 55,000,000.[3]

39, pp. 372 sq., 601 sq., 653 sq., 666 sq. The Cologne and Munich Annals of the Propagation of the Faith; *The Catholic Missions*, Freiburg and St. Louis, year 1873, pp. 62 and 92; year 1876, p. 87. A Full Report, in 1867, of the African Institutes of Egypt, established by Daniel Comboni, Vienna, 1871. (Tr.)

[1] *Catholic Missions*, 1876, pp. 22 and 169 sq. (Tr.)

[2] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, 1877, pp. 61, 62. (Tr.)

[3] For statistics, consult *Cath. Almanac* of 1878; *Gerarchia Cattolica* of 1877. For general information, see *Wittmann*, l. c., Vol. I., pp. 18–253; *Henrion* and *Hahn*. For details concerning special countries, consult the *Freiburg Eccl. Cyclopaed.*, Vol. XII., pp. 34–50; Fr. tr., Vol. 1, pp. 235–288. *Gams*, l. c., Vol. III., pp. 644–674. *O'Kane Murray*, Ch. H. of the U. S.; 5th ed., New York,

Hosted by Google

In the year 1831 the sachems of the Algonquins and Iroquois sent to the Holy Father some articles made with their own hands, accompanied with the following touching letter: "Thou art the Shepherd of all the faithful; thou hast taught us to know Jesus Christ; thou didst send us the men of the black robe, saying to them, 'Go, seek the Indians; they are my children; help and assist them.' Thou art our Father, and we will never acknowledge any other. Should our descendants forget thee and lapse into error, show them these gifts, and they will return to thee." In spite of the difficulties nuturally growing out of the suspicion with which the English government of Canada has regarded the Church, the Indians of the Province of Quebec are entirely Catholic; while in the Province of Ontario there are also many considerable Catholic communities among them. The bishops, apostolic vicars, and missionaries engaged in these countries displayed so great zeal and were so successful in their labors that Gregory XVI., by a bull dated July 12, 1844, united all the dioceses of Upper and Lower Canada in one province, in which were included the metropolitan see of *Quebec*, established in 1674, and the suffragan sees of *Kingston*, *Montreal*, and *Toronto*, established respectively in 1826, 1836, and 1842. To these were added, as time went on, those of *St. Boniface* (1842), *Ottawa* (1848), *Three Rivers* (1852), *St. Hyacinth* (1852), *London* (1856), *Hamilton* (1856), *St. Albert's* (1859), *Saint-Germain* of *Rimouski* (1867), and the apostolic vicariates of Athabaska-Mackenzie (1853), and British Columbia (1863).

In 1870 a second province was formed, with *Toronto* as the metropolitan see, and Kingston, Hamilton, London, and the apostolic vicariate of Northern Canada (established 1874), in the Province of Ontario, as suffragans. A third province, that of *St. Boniface*, was formed in 1871, including the archiepiscopal see of St. Boniface, the diocese of *St. Albert*, and the apostolic vicariates of Athabaska-Mackenzie and British Columbia.

Halifax was created a bishopric in 1843 and an archbishopric in 1852, with *Charlottetown*, P. E. Island (1832); *St. John*, N. B. (1842); *Arichat*, with seat at *Antigonish* (1844); and *Chatham*, N. B. (1860), as suffragan sees; the dioceses of *St. John* and *Harbor Grace*, Newfoundland, being directly subject to the Holy See. By a decree dated September 17, 1871, the western portion of the island of Newfoundland was made an apostolic prefecture, called *St. George*. The French islands, *St. Pierre* and *Miquelon*, off the Southern coast of Newfoundland, form likewise an apostolic prefecture.

Father *Burke* labored with eminent success as a missionary for twenty years in what is now the *Province of Halifax*. He died in 1827, and was succeeded in the direction of the mission by Rev. *William Frazer* (1821–1840) and *William Walsh*, the first Archbishop of Halifax. His successor was the Most Rev. *Thomas L. Conolly*, consecrated Bishop of St. John, N. B., in 1852, and transferred to Halifax in 1859. He was succeeded in 1877 by the present archbishop, Most Rev. *Michael Hannan*. The diocese of *Vancouver's Island* belongs to the Province of Oregon, in the United States. Its bishop, Mgr. *Seghers*, who has also charge of *Alaska*, sailed up the river Yukon in July, 1877, as far as Nulato, in search of a suitable position for a missionary station.

1877. *Lembke*, O. S. B., Life and Labors of Prince Gallitzin, being a Supplement to the Hist. of Cath. Missions in North America (1799–1840), Münster, 1861.

Hosted by Google

There is probably no country of the world in which the Church is making such rapid progress as in the *United States of North America*. There are, it is true, Protestant sects, representing almost every form of belief, and even every shade of thought of which the human mind is capable; but as for any definite and fixed religious system, held consistently and uniformly by a large body of men from supernatural motives, there is none. The multitudinous and varied sects of Protestantism prove conclusively that as a systematic body of religious teaching it has ceased, and ceased forever, to exercise any beneficial influence over the minds of men, and that as an organization it has literally gone to pieces. True, there are many churches under ostensibly the same denominational title, but every American knows that no two of their ministers believe or teach the same doctrines, and that the minds of the hearers, if not completely indifferent or thoroughly saturated with infidelity, are still more hopelessly confused than those of their so-called teachers. Protestantism in the United States, except in a few isolated cases, has lost all positive religious meaning, unless man-worship be received as a truth revealed of God. Any one who has the slightest acquaintance with non-Catholic society in the United States will bear us out when we say that it is the *preacher*, and not the *teaching*, that constitutes the attraction of the various Protestant churches, and particularly of those known as the fashionable churches of the cities and larger towns. There is, however, one office which those professing to represent Protestantism perform with creditable zeal and consistency—they keep alive the anti-Catholic prejudice. The Catholic Church has been so long shut out from all influence in countries where the English language is spoken, that, not only the religious, but the political, social, and professional traditions of these countries have grown hostile to her and suspicious of her claims. The very literature is poisoned with this ubiquitous and all-pervading tradition. No historical controversy is carried on without an appeal being made to it; no politico-religious question is discussed without reference to some exceptional fact in history, colored by succeeding generations of writers under the influence of the same tradition. It has now ceased to be distinctively Protestant, because Protestantism is no more; it has become the heritage of English institutions and of English literature, and will be as difficult to remove as the malaria from the atmosphere of the Roman Campagna. The minds of the bulk of English-speaking people are still sensitive of the claims of the Church, and to irritate this sensibility is the office those professing to teach Protestantism are most intent upon performing. But the negative and disintegrating character of Protestantism, while it is deplorable as a phase of religious life, serves to throw the unity, the majesty, and the perpetuity of the Catholic Church into bolder relief in the United States. The following statistics will serve to give, at least in outline, some idea of the extraordinary growth of the Church in this portion of North America:

In *New Mexico*, which has been a portion of the United States since 1840, the bishopric of *Santa Fé*, established in 1850, was raised to the rank of an archbishopric in 1875, and includes the apostolic vicariates of *Colorado* (1868) and *Arizona* (1869). The number of Catholics, which is rapidly on the increase, is at present about 110,000, of whom 8,000 are Pueblo Indians (that is, dwelling in villages), 1,000 native Americans, and the rest Mexicans. The Christian

Hosted by Google

Brothers have a college at Santa Fé, and the Society of Jesus another at *Las Vegas*, the professors of which conduct the *Rivista Catolica* newspaper.

In *Texas* the mission of *San Antonio* was founded above a century and a half ago by the Franciscans, who were expelled the country in 1812, and when they returned in 1840 found only 10,000 Catholics of the 130,000 they had left behind them. The apostolic vicariate of Texas, established in 1840, became the bishopric of *Galveston* in 1847, and in 1874 was divided into the bishopric of *San Antonio* and the apostolic vicariate of *Brownsville*. The first incumbent of the see of Galveston was Mgr. *Odin*, who made several voyages to Europe in the interest of his diocese, and brought back with him a number of zealous priests, ready to share his labors. The missions of Father *Weninger*, S. J., have been here, as elsewhere in the United States, remarkably successful in reviving fervor of religious life among the Catholics. The Lazarists, the Oblates of the Immaculate Conception, the Benedictines, the Brothers of Mary, the Sisters of the Incarnation, and the Ursulines have all houses in this State, and are actively at work in their several fields of labor.

Previously to the independence of the original colonies, many English Catholics, to escape penal restrictions and civil disabilities at home, immigrated thither, but their number never exceeded 25,000. During the War of Independence, they were placed under the jurisdiction of the apostolic vicariate of London, the incumbent being then the celebrated Bishop *Challoner;* but after the close of the war it was thought proper to place the United States under a distinct ecclesiastical administration, and accordingly in 1789 the see of *Baltimore* was established, and the Right Rev. *John Carroll* appointed its first bishop. The Catholic population of the United States increased rapidly, mainly through immigration from Ireland and Germany, and in 1843 was set down at 1,500,000, and is at present variously estimated, the highest number being 8,000,000, and the lowest 5,000,000. By a brief dated April 8, 1808, Pius VII. raised Baltimore to the rank of a metropolitan see, with *New Orleans* (established in 1793), *New York*, *Philadelphia*, *Boston*, and *Bardstown* (now Louisville) as suffragans. The saintly Bishop *Flaget* was the first incumbent of the last named see. The bishopric of *Charleston*, *S. C.*, was established in 1820, and *Dr. England*, recently from Ireland, appointed its first bishop. Those of *Cincinnati* and *Richmond* were both established in 1821, the first incumbent of the former being Bishop *Fenwick*, O. S. D., and Dr. *Kelly* of the latter. *Mobile* was established in 1824; *St. Louis* in 1826; *Detroit* in 1832; *Vincennes* in 1834; *Dubuque*, *Nashville*, and *Natchez* in 1837; *San Francisco* in 1840; *Pittsburg*, *Little Rock*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Oregon* in 1843; *Chicago*, *Hartford*, and *Milwaukee* in 1844; and in 1846 Oregon was raised to the rank of an archbishopric. The sees of *Albany*, *Buffalo*, *Cleveland*, and *Galveston* were established in 1847, and *St. Louis* raised to an archbishopric in the same year, with the Most Rev. *P. R. Kenrick* as incumbent. In 1850, Pius IX., then in exile at Gaëta, raised *New York*, *Cincinnati*, and *New Orleans* to metropolitan rank, their respective incumbents being Most Rev. *John Hughes*, Most Rev. *John B. Purcell*, and Most Rev. *A. Blanc;* and at the same time established the sees of *Wheeling*, *Savannah*, and *St. Paul*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Santa Fé*, in New Mexico; transferred the episcopal see of Walla-Walla to *Nesqually*, appointed a bishop to *Montery*,

Hosted by Google

in Upper California, and erected the apostolic vicariate of *Kansas*, and in the following year that of *Nebraska*.

At the request of the Bishops of the United States, assembled in the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Holy See established in 1853 the sees of *Brooklyn*, *Burlington*, *Covington*, *Erie*, *Natchitoches*, *Newark*, and *Portland;* and in the same year San Francisco was made an archbishopric. In 1857 the sees of *Alton*, *Saut Ste. Marie* (transferred in 1865 to *Marquette*), *Fort Wayne*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Florida* were established; and in 1868, at the suggestion of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, those of *Columbus*, *Grass Valley* (which replaced the apostolic vicariate of Marysville, established in 1861), *Green Bay*, *Harrisburg*, *La Crosse*, *Rochester*, *Scranton*, *St. Joseph's*, and *Wilmington*, together with the apostolic vicariates of *Colorado*, *North Carolina*, and *Idaho* (two districts). In 1869 the apostolic vicariate of *Arizona* (with seat at *Tucson*) was established; in 1870 the see at *Springfield;* in 1872 those of *Ogdensburg* and *Providence;* and in 1874 that of *San Antonio* and the apostolic vicariate of *Brownsville* (with seat at *Corpus Christi*). In 1875 the bishoprics of Philadelphia, Boston, Milwaukee, and Santa Fé were raised to metropolitan rank, and an apostolic vicariate given to *Northern Minnesota* (with seat at *St. Cloud*); in 1876 an apostolic prefecture was established for the *Indian Territory;* and, finally, in 1877 *Peoria* was made a bishopric, and the apostolic vicariate of *Kansas* changed into the episcopal see of *Leavenworth*.

The following is a list of the ecclesiastical provinces of the Catholic Church in the United States, with their several metropolitan and suffragan sees, from which a pretty fair estimate may be formed of the growth of Catholicity in the great American Union in the course of a century:

I. Province of Baltimore, comprising the States of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and East Florida. Metropolitan see: *Baltimore*, Md. Suffragan sees: *Charleston*, S. C.; *Richmond*, Va.; *Savannah*, Ga.; *St. Augustine*, Fla.; *Wheeling*, W. Va.; *Wilmington*, Del.; and the apostolic vicariate of *North Carolina*.

II. Province of Philadelphia, comprising the State of Pennsylvania. Metropolitan See: *Philadelphia*. Suffragan sees: *Pittsburg and Allegheny*, *Harrisburg*, *Scranton*, and *Erie*.

III. Province of New York, comprising the States of New York and New Jersey. Metropolitan see: *New York*. Suffragan sees: *Albany*, *Brooklyn*, *Buffalo*, *Rochester*, *Ogdensburg*, all in the State of New York, and *Newark*, in New Jersey.

IV. Province of Boston, comprising the New England States. Metropolitan see: *Boston*, Mass. Suffragan sees: *Springfield*, Mass.; *Burlington*, Vt.; *Portland*, Me.; *Hartford*, Conn.; and *Providence*, R. I.

V. Province of Cincinnati, comprising the States of Ohio, Indiana, Southern Michigan, and Kentucky. Metropolitan see: *Cincinnati*, O. Suffragan sees: *Cleveland* and *Columbus*, O.; *Detroit*, Mich.; *Louisville* and *Covington*, Ky.; and *Vincennes* and *Fort Wayne*, Ind.

VI. Province of Milwaukee, comprising the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, Northern Michigan, and Dakota Territory. Metropolitan see: *Milwaukee*, Wis. Suffragan sees: *Green Bay* and *La Crosse*, Wis.; *Marquette* and

Hosted by Google

Saut Ste. Marie, Mich.; *St. Paul*, Minn.; and the apostolic vicariate of *Northern Minnesota.*

VII. Province of St. Louis, comprising the States of Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Indian Territory. Metropolitan see: *St. Louis*, Mo. Suffragan sees: *St. Joseph's*, Mo.; *Alton*, *Peoria*, and *Chicago*, Ill.; *Dubuque*, Iowa; *Nashville*, Tenn.; *Leavenworth*, Kan.; and the apostolic vicariate of *Nebraska*, with seat at Omaha.

VIII. Province of New Orleans, comprising the States of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Arkansas. Metropolitan see: *New Orleans*, La. Suffragan sees: *Natchitoches*, La.; *Mobile*, Ala.; *Natchez*, Miss.; *Little Rock*, Ark.; *Galveston* and *San Antonio*, and the apostolic vicariate of *Brownsville*, Texas.

IX. Province of San Francisco, comprising the States of California and Nevada and all the territory lying west of the Rio Colorado. Metropolitan see: *San Francisco.* Suffragan sees: *Grass Valley*, *Montery* (and *Los Angelos*), both in California.

X. Province of Oregon, comprising the State of Oregon, Washington Territory, Idaho, Vancouver's Island, and Alaska. Metropolitan see: *Oregon*, W. T. Suffragan sees: *Nesqually*, W. T.; *Vancouver's Island* (with seat at *Victoria*); and the apostolic vicariate of *Idaho.*

XI. Province of Santa Fé, comprising New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona. Metropolitan see: *Santa Fé*, N. M. Suffragan apostolic vicariates: *Colorado* and *Arizona.*

There are also six *mitred abbots* in the United States, viz: one at *St. Vincent's* Pa.; one at *St. Meinrad's* Ind.; one at *Clinton*, Minn.; one at *Atchison*, Kan.; one at *Gethsemani*, Ky.; and one at *New Melleray*, Iowa. The first four belong to the Order of *St. Benedict*, and the last two to that of *La Trappe.*

According to the Catholic Almanac of 1878, there are in the United States, belonging to the Catholic Church, 11 ecclesiastical provinces, 59 archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, 7 apostolic vicariates, 1 apostolic prefecture, 6 mitred abbots, 5,548 priests, 5,634 churches, 1,777 chapels and stations, 21 theological seminaries, 1,121 ecclesiastical students, 74 colleges, 519 academies and select schools, 2,130 parish schools, 248 orphanages, and 102 hospitals.

The bishops of the United States, who, by absolute, inalienable right, and not by tolerance or concession or privilege, worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, obedient to the instructions of the Council of Trent, began to hold provincial and national synods as soon as circumstances permitted them to do so. Seven provincial councils were held in Baltimore between the years 1829 and 1849, and two national councils have been held in the same city. Provincial councils were also held in several other metropolitan cities. The First Plenary Council of Baltimore, presided over by the Most Rev. *Francis Patrick Kenrick*, Archbishop of Baltimore and Apostolic Delegate of the Holy See, was held in May, 1852, there being six archbishops and twenty-six bishops in attendance. By a decree of July 25, 1858, the prerogative of precedence was vested in the see of *Baltimore*, thus giving the archbishop of that city the right to preside at all plenary councils or other ecclesiastical assemblages of the archbishops and bishops of the United States.

The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in October, 1866, was pre-

Hosted by Google

sided over by the Most Rev. *Martin John Spalding*, as Apostolic Delegate of the Holy See, and attended by forty-four archbishops and bishops, two mitred abbots, many superiors of Religious Orders, and a large number of theologians.

The contributions to the theological and ecclesiastical literature of the United States made by Archbishop Kenrick[1] and Archbishop Spalding are both numerous and valuable. Both were men of eminent piety and learning. An elegant life of the latter has been written by his nephew, the present Bishop of Peoria.[2] Since the opening of the present century, many great bishops, whose lives have lent a luster to the Church in America, have passed to their reward. The most eminent of these are Bruté, Flaget, David, Dubois, England, Rosati, the two Fenwicks (one of Cincinnati and the other of Boston), *Hughes*,[3] Kenrick, and Spalding, whose names will be held in grateful and abiding remembrance by succeeding generations.[4]

The RELIGIOUS ORDERS in the United States are so numerous, and the scope of their labors so extensive, that it is difficult in a work like this to do more than enumerate them.

In point of time, the *Sulpicians* were the first to make a permanent settlement in the States of North America. Of this Congregation, founded in 1645 by *M. Olier*, for the exclusive purpose of educating and training candidates for the priesthood, four Fathers and three seminarists, sent out by *M. Émery*, under the care of Father *Charles Nagot* († 1806), came to the United States in 1791, and, after some time, opened the *Theological Seminary of St. Mary's, Baltimore*, to which was attached a collegiate or preparatory department. The latter was subsequently removed to Ellicot City, Howard county, Md. In March, 1822, Pius VII. granted the Faculty of St. Mary's the right of conferring University degrees. This Congregation gave to the young Church in America many of the brightest ornaments in both orders of her hierarchy,

[1] The works of Most Rev. *F. P. Kenrick* are: The Catholic Doctrine of Justification, Philadelphia, 1 vol.; The Primacy of the Apostolic See, ibid., 1838 (tr. into Germ. by Steinbacher, N. Y., 1853); Theologia Dogmatica, 3 vols., Phila., 1839, 1840; Theologia Moralis, ibid., 1841 (rev. ed., Mechlin, 1861); Treatise on Baptism and Confirmation, Phila., 1843, Balt, 1852; Vindication of the Cath. Church, Balt., 1855; Translation (and Annotation) of all the Books of the O. and N. T., publ. at N. Y. and Balt. betw. 1849–1860. (TR.)

[2] Most Rev. *M. J. Spalding's* works: Evidences of Catholicity, Louisville, 1847 (4th ed., Baltimore, 1866); Life of Bishop Flaget, Louisville, 1852; Miscellanea, ibid., 1855; Reviews, Lectures, and Essays, ibid., 1855; Sketches of Ky., ibid.; A Hist. of the Prot. Ref. in Germany and Switzerland, 2 vols., Louisville, 1860 (4th ed., Balt., 1866); Hist. of Engl. Lit., N. Y., 1862; Spir. Retr., Louisville, 1864. The Life of the Most Rev. M. J. Spalding, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore, by *J. L. Spalding*, S. T. L., New York, 1873. (TR.)

[3] His Life, by *J. R. G. Hassard*, New York, 1866; His Works, ed. by *L. Kehoe*, New York, 1865; Hughes and Breckinridge's Controversy, Philadelphia, 1835. (TR.)

[4] See *R. H. Clarke's* Lives of Deceased Bishops of the U. S., N. Y., 1872, 2 vols. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

among whom may be mentioned *Flaget*, *Maréchal*, *Bruté*, *Dubois*, *Dubourg*, *Nagot*, *Badin*, *Richard*, and *Fredet*.

We have already seen that previously to the suppression of the *Society of Jesus*, its members were among the first and greatest missionaries in the country. After its suppression, Charles Carroll and six companions, who arrived from Europe at the opening of the present century, perpetuated its traditions in the *Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, under the direction of the Rev. *Robert Molyneux*, which they entered May 10, 1805. Other members of the suppressed Society, as they arrived from Europe, were sent to the old Jesuit missions of Maryland and Pennsylvania, or as professors to the *College of Georgetown*, D. C. The Colleges under the charge of the restored Society (1814) have been already enumerated (at p. 685); but their greatest educational establishment for higher studies in the United States, and one of the foremost Catholic philosophical and theological schools of the world, is that at *Woodstock*, Md., where the young men of the Society are trained in these branches. Their principal novitiate is at Frederick, in the same State. There are two Provinces belonging to the Society in the United States, namely, those of *Maryland* and *Missouri*, besides the five missions of *New York*, *New Orleans*, *California*, *New Mexico*, and *Buffalo*. The Society within the United States contains about 750 members. The "missions" given by the Jesuit Fathers have been attended with unparalleled success, and the names of *DeSmet*, *McElroy*, *Smarius*, *Damen*, and *Weninger* are familiar to every Catholic American.

The first house of the *Dominicans* in the United States was founded at *St. Rose's*, Ky., by the Rev. Edward D. Fenwick, subsequently Bishop of Cincinnati, who, accompanied by three Fathers from the English mission, arrived from Europe in 1805. The convent of St. Joseph's, Perry county, Ohio, was founded in 1818, and Rev. *Nicholas Young*, who assisted Father Fenwick in building the first chapel in the same State, is still alive, being now past eighty, but still hale and hearty. Bishop Fenwick, after his appointment to the see of Cincinnati, introduced into his diocese the Sisters of St. Dominic and the Sisters of Charity from Emmittsburg. In 1852, when the latter affiliated with the Mother House in Paris, the colony in the diocese of Cincinnati, then as now presided over by the venerable Archbishop Purcell, clung to the traditions and dress of Mother Seton, and formed a separate community, which is now in a very flourishing condition, numbering two hundred and fifty members, scattered through many dioceses, and having charge of parochial schools, orphanages, hospitals, and a foundling house. The Dominican Fathers are mainly occupied in giving missions and teaching in colleges. The Order has eight establishments in the United States, two of which are in Kentucky, two in Ohio, one in Tennessee, one in New York, one in Washington, D. C., and one in New Jersey, besides other houses in California. Not including the members in the last named State, there are about fifty Dominican priests in the United States. The present Archbishop of San Francisco, Most Rev. *Sadoc Alemany*, and the present Bishop of St. Paul, Right Rev. *Thomas L. Grace*, were formerly members of the Order.

The *Benedictines*, of whom there are at present about 300 in the United States, were introduced in 1846 by the Right Rev. Abbot General *Bonifacius Wimmer*, of Metten, Bavaria. Besides nine Priories, they have Abbacies at *St. Vincent's*,

Hosted by Google

Penn.; *St. Louis on the Lake*, Minn.; and *Atchison*, Kan. The Swiss Benedictines, from *Maria Einsiedeln*, founded an abbey at St. Meinrad's, Ind., which is now in a very flourishing condition. There is also a college attached to each of these abbeys, all of which are prospering.

There are many branches of the numerous family of the *Franciscans* in the United States. The *Recollects*, who came to Cincinnati, O., more than thirty years ago, have a *Gymnasium* in that city, and attached to the same *Custody*, under the patronage of *St. John the Baptist*, the Houses of Study at *Oldenburg*, Ind., and *Louisville*, Ky. The Recollects have also Colleges at *Teutopolis* and *Quincy*, Ill.; and *Santa Barbara*, Cal. A colony of Franciscans from Rome settled at Alleghany, New York, in 1854, where they have a College. The *Capuchins* have a house in New York and another in Wisconsin, to which Calvary College is attached. The *Conventuals* have many important establishments in the United States, and conduct two Colleges, one at *Loreto*, Pa., founded in 1847, and another at *Brooklyn*, N. Y.

The first *Trappists* came to the United States in 1805, but subsequently settled in Nova Scotia, where they founded the abbey of *New Clairvaux*. The next colony, in charge of Father *Eutropius*, arrived in 1848, and settled at *Gethsemane*, Nelson county, Ky., where they have now a large and beautiful abbey, under the patronage of *Our Lady of La Trappe*. A third colony from Ireland went to Iowa, and founded the flourishing abbey of *New Melleray*.

A colony of *Augustinians*, from Dublin, Ireland, came to the United States in 1790, and settled in Philadelphia, where they largely contributed to the spread and progress of Catholicity. They were burnt out by a mob in 1844, but the church and rectory of St. Augustine were subsequently rebuilt. They are tolerably numerous, and have at the present time thirteen establishments in the country, the chief of which is the monastery of Villanova, near Philadelphia, to which a College, with the privileges of a University, is attached.

In 1815 the *Priests of the Congregation of the Mission* were brought from Rome to New Orleans by Bishop Dubourg, and three years later founded the Seminary of *St. Mary's of the Barrens*, Perry county, Mo., which was for many years the nursery of the missionaries of the Mississippi Valley. The priests of this Congregation now number about eighty, are chiefly engaged in giving missions, and possess thirteen religious houses. They have churches in St. Louis, New Orleans, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and other large cities, and conduct, besides St. Mary's of the Barrens, St. Vincent's Seminary and College, *Cape Girardeau*, Mo.; the Seminary of Our Lady of Angels, *Niagara Falls*, N. Y.; St. John B.'s Seminary and College, *Brooklyn*, N. Y.; St. Vincent's College, *Los Angeles*, Cal.; and *Germantown* Day College, Pa.

In 1832 three Fathers of the *Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer* arrived at Baltimore from Austria, and took charge of the rapidly growing *German* Catholic population of that city, and gradually extended their labors to Catholics of other nationalities. The Congregation now counts about one hundred and sixty members, who have the care of churches in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, New York, New Orleans, Chicago, St. Louis, and in others of the more considerable cities. On November 5, 1875, the Redemptorists of the United States were divided into the two *Provinces of Baltimore and St. Louis*. Their House of Studies is at *Ilchester*, Md. The late learned Bishop *Neumann*,

Hosted by Google

of Philadelphia, belonged to this Congregation, as does also Bishop *Gross*, at present of Savannah.

The *Congregation of the Holy Cross*, founded in France immediately after the Revolution, and approved by the Holy See as a teaching body, was introduced into the United States in 1841 by Father *Sorin*, the present General. Besides the Mother House, *Notre Dame*, near *South Bend*, Ind., it has nineteen houses scattered through Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Texas. Their more considerable educational establishments are the University of Notre Dame, near South Bend, Ind., where the *Ave Maria*, a magazine, devoted exclusively to promoting the honor of the Blessed Virgin, is published; St. Mary's College, *Galveston*, Texas; and the College of the Sacred Heart, *Watertown*, Wisconsin. There are at present more than two hundred members in the Congregation, including priests and brothers.

The *Congregation of the Most Precious Blood*, founded by the venerable *Gaspar Bufalo* († 1837), was introduced into the United States by Father *de Sales Brunner* in 1844, and now possesses many religious houses and two Seminaries, one at *Carthagena*, O., and another at *Rohnerville*, Cal.

The first band of the *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, founded in France in 1684 by the venerable *John B. de la Salle*, and approved by Benedict XIII. in 1725, came to the United States in 1846, and began work first at Baltimore, and shortly after at New York. These efficient educators conduct *colleges* at *New York*, *Baltimore*, *St. Louis*, *San Francisco* (two), *Philadelphia*, *Buffalo*, *Memphis*, *Prairie du Chien*, and *Santa Fé*, besides numerous schools and academies in the more important cities, which are attended by about 26,000 pupils. Their number is above 700, and they possess altogether 49 establishments of various kinds, of which seven are orphanages, the best known of these latter being the *Catholic Protectory at Westchester*, N. Y.

The *Brothers of Mary*, also devoted to education, founded in France in 1817 by Rev. *Wm. Jos. Cheminade*, and approved by Gregory XVI. in 1839, were introduced into the United States in 1849, and possess at present 23 houses in the States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Illinois, Louisiana, and Texas.

The *Congregation of Missionary Priests*, known as the *Oblates of Mary Immaculate*, founded in 1816 by Mgr. *Charles de Mazenod*, subsequently Bishop of Marseilles, and approved by Leo XII. in 1826, after laboring zealously among the Indian tribes of Athabasca-Mackenzie for many years, crossed over to the United States in 1848, where they have now seven houses, and conduct St. Mary's College, *Galveston*, Texas; St. Joseph's, *Brownsville*, Texas; and St. Michael's, *Jefferson*, La. They have also charge of an Indian school and five Indian missions in Washington Territory.

The *Passionists*, founded in 1735 by St. Paul of the Cross, whose aim was to combine the activity of the Jesuit with the austerity of the Trappist, were first introduced into the United States from Rome by Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburg, in 1853. They are chiefly engaged in giving missions, and their missions throughout the country have been uniformly eminently successful. They have at present prosperous houses at Birmingham, Pa.; Hoboken and Dunkirk, N. Y.; Baltimore, Md. and Cincinnati, O..

Hosted by Google

The *Xaverian Brothers*, founded at Bruges, Belgium, by Brother Francis Xavier (*Thos. Jas. Ryken*) in 1839, and introduced into the United States by Bishop Spalding, of Louisville, in 1854, have under their charge, besides eight parochial schools, *Mt. St. Joseph's College*, Carrollton, Md., incorporated in 1876.

The *Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle*, founded by the Very Rev. *I. T. Hecker* in 1858, was intended to meet and supply the religious wants peculiar to Americans, and is characteristically a missionary Congregation. It possesses as yet only one house in the United States, that of New York city. The *Catholic World* and the *Catholic Publication Society* are both the products of this Congregation, which, it is to be hoped, will have a long career of usefulness.

The *Priests of the Congregation of the Resurrection* conduct St. Mary's College, Marion county, Ky.

The *Missionaries of the Sacred Heart* have a House of Studies and a Novitiate at *Watertown*, in the diocese of Ogdensburg, N. Y.

It is impossible, in a work like this, to give a detailed history of the numerous RELIGIOUS ORDERS AND CONGREGATIONS OF WOMEN in the United States. Their spirit of self-sacrifice is beyond all praise, and the blessings their labors have brought upon the Catholics of that country beyond computation. No better testimony to their merits could be given than that contained in the words applied to them by the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (Nro. 415).[1]

The number of CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND SEMINARIES IN THE UNITED STATES for the education and training of young men, whether seculars or ecclesiastics, has increased with the growth of the Church, and is at present about seventy-five. Those under the care of Religious Orders have already been noticed, and it only remains to say a few words of those conducted by secular priests.

Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Md., was founded in 1809 by the Rev. Father *Dubois*, later on Bishop of New York, and was subsequently directed by Father *Bruté*, who has been called its "*Good Angel*," and by the Rev. Dr. *Purcell*, the present Archbishop of Cincinnati, during whose incumbency it obtained (1830) the power of conferring degrees. Among the illustrious men whom it has given to the Church in America the names of Archbishop Hughes, Archbishop Purcell, and Cardinal McCloskey stand pre-eminent.

The Seminary of *St. Charles Borromeo*, at Overbrook, Pa., was founded by Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia, in 1838, and at once empowered to confer degrees. The discipline of this institution is strictly in accord with the prescriptions of the Council of Trent. Dr. *Corcoran*, the distinguished theologian, Oriental scholar, and editor of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, which has taken the place of the famous *Brownson's Quarterly*, suspended at the close of 1875, is a member of its Faculty. The building itself, erected under the auspices of Archbishop *Wood*, is one of the finest structures in the world devoted to the purposes of Catholic education, and cost above a half a million of dollars.

Mt. St. Mary's of the West, at Cincinnati, Ohio, founded by Archbishop *Purcell* in 1848, and opened for the reception of students on October 2, 1851, re-

[1] The following statistical table from the Church History of the United

Hosted by Google

ceived a charter empowering it to confer collegiate degrees in 1856. By the Provincial Council of 1858 it was made the provincial seminary for theological, and *St. Thomas'*, near Bardstown, Ky., founded by Bishop *David* in 1814, and subsequently transferred to St. Joseph's, Bardstown, for preparatory or collegiate studies. Since 1863 Mt. St. Mary's has been a strictly ecclesiastical institution. Its collegiate course embraces seven and its theological three years. It contains a valuable library, numbering about 16,000 volumes.

The Seminary of St. Francis de Sales, Milwaukee, Wis., was founded by the Rev. Dr. *Salzmann*, in July, 1855, under the auspices of the Most Rev. *M. Henni*, first Bishop and Archbishop of Milwaukee. It is provided at present

States, by Mr. *J. O'Kane Murray*, is tolerably full and accurate, and will give a pretty correct idea of the Religious Orders and Congregations of women in that country:

Name of Order.	Founded.	Introduced into the U. S.	Number of houses.	Academies.	Schools.	Asylums.	Hospitals.	Total No. of Members.
Ursulines	1535	1727	12	12	.....	.....	.....	360
Carmelites	1542	1790	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	31
Visitation Nuns	1610	1808	18	18	.....	.....	.....	Circa 350
Sisters of Charity (Emmittsburg, Md.)	1809	1809	102	1	50	38	30	1151
Sisters of Charity (Mt. St. Vincent's, N.Y.)	1809	1809	81	16	48	13	2	600
*Sisters of Charity (St. Joseph's, Delhi, Hamilton county, O.)	1809	1809	31	5	25	3	2	250
Ladies of the Sacred Heart	1800	1818	20	20	15	2	.....	819
Sisters of Charity (of Nazareth)	1812	1812	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	290
Sisters of Loreto	1812	1812	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	326
Dominican Nuns	1296	1823	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy	1829	1829	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100
Sisters of St. Joseph	1650	1836	60	42	.....	20	9	1500
Sisters of the Holy Cross	1834	1843	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	250
Sisters of Mercy	1830	1843	55	50	30	30	20	Circa 1350
Sisters of the Good Shepherd	1651	1843	17	.....	.....	.....	.....	500
Sisters of Notre Dame	1804	1840	22	.....	.....	.....	.....	Circa 350
Sisters of Providence	1812	1839	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
School Sisters of Notre Dame	1597	1847	108	.....	.....	.....	.....	1000
Presentation Nuns	1777	1854	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	150
Gray Nuns	1747	1854	3	.....	.....	3	2	28
Sisters of Charity (of the House of Providence)	1843	1854	10	2	8	4	2	64
Servite Sisters	1233	1870	1	.....	1	.....	.....	7
Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ	1849	1868	7	.....	5	1	1	62
Little Sisters of the Poor	1840	1868	18	.....	.....	.....	.....	200

*Added by Translator.

In addition to the above, the following should also be enumerated: Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis; Sisters of St. Claire; Benedictine Nuns; Ladies of the Incarnate Word; Sisters of Our Lady of Charity; Daughters of the Cross; Oblate Sisters of Providence (colored); Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin; Sisters of Notre Dame, of Namur; Sisters of the Holy Names; Sisters of St. Ann; Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis; Sisters of the Precious Blood; Sisters of Christian Charity; Sisters of the Agonizing Heart of Jesus; Sisters of the Holy Childhood; Sister Servants of the Immaculate Heart; Sisters of the Humility of Mary; Sisters of the Immaculate Conception; Sisters of the Holy Family; and the Polish Sisters of St. Felix; in all *forty-five* Religious Orders of women in the Union.

Hosted by Google

with a corps of thirteen professors, and attended by 265 students, 133 of whom are studying theology and philosophy.

St. Joseph's Provincial Theological Seminary, Troy, New York, was founded in 1864 by Archbishop Hughes. Its first corps of professors came from Belgium, but some chairs have been since filled by Americans.

The *Seminary of the Immaculate Conception*, South Orange, N. J., connected with *Seton Hall* College, was founded in 1856 by the Right Rev. *J. Roosevelt Bayley*, then Bishop of Newark, but subsequently appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore, where he died in 1877. This institution was empowered to confer degrees in 1861.

There are also theological seminaries conducted by secular priests at *New Orleans*, *Louisville*, and *Cleveland;* and preparatory seminaries at *Rochester*, N. Y.; *Norfolk*, Va.; *Savannah*, Ga.; and *Bardstown*, Ky.; and a number of students studying for the dioceses of the United States at the North American College, *Rome;* at the American College, *Louvain;* at St. Sulpice, *Paris;* and at the Grand Seminary of *Montreal*.

Great as are the advantages enjoyed by the Catholics of the United States in the matter of higher education, they are by no means equal to those enjoyed by their co-religionists and neighbors of *Canada*. The latter have also a well organized system of Public Schools, which here, as in *Australia* and *Capeland*, receive a due proportion of the public funds set apart for educational purposes.

The *Laval University*, founded in 1852, is an outgrowth of the *Seminary of Quebec*, founded in 1663 by Mgr. *Laval*, first Bishop of Canada. It was empowered by royal charter to confer degrees in arts, science, law, and medicine, and by the Holy See in theology, and has 26 professors.

At Quèbec there is a *Greater Seminary*, attended by 42 students, and a *Lesser*, attended by 225 interns and 293 externs. In the same diocese are the seminaries of *Notre Dame de Lévis*, *St. Ann*, and that of *Chicoutimi*, completed in 1873.

In the diocese of Montreal the institutions of learning are still more numerous. The *Sulpicians* have here their *Grand Seminary*, with 200 seminarists reading theology; their *Seminary for Philosophy*, and their *College* for preparatory studies, besides the Seminary of St. Sulpice, the Seminary of *St. Teresa*, and the College of the *Assumption;* all under their care. *St. Mary's College of Montreal* is under the direction of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. The *Clercs de St. Viateur*, numbering over one hundred, have their Novitiate and a College at *Joliette;* another College at *Bourget*, in the diocese of Montreal, and have charge of twenty-one establishments besides, eighteen of which are in the province of Quebec and three in the United States.

The *Congregation of the Holy Cross* has its provincial house for Canada, *Notre Dame Côte des Neiges*, near Montreal, and in the same diocese the Colleges of *St. Laurent*, *Notre Dame*, and *St. Jérome*.

The diocesan seminary of the diocese of *Ottawa* and *Ottawa College* are both conducted by the Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate.

The dioceses of *St. Germain de Rimouski*, *St. Hyacinth*, *Sherbrooke*, and *Three Rivers* have each a seminary at the episcopal seat, and the last named has a second one at *Nicolet*.

In the *Province of Toronto*, Ontario, are the following educational establish-

Hosted by Google

ments: *St. Michael's College*, embracing preparatory and theological departments, and *De La Salle Institute*, the former conducted by the Basilian Fathers, and the latter by the Christian Brothers, and both situated in the city of Toronto; *St. Jerome's College*, Berlin, in the diocese of *Hamilton;* a *School for Boys*, in charge of the Christian Brothers at *Kingston;* and *Assumption College* at *Sandwich*, in the diocese of London, under the care of the Basilian Fathers.

In the *Province of Halifax* the following: *St. Mary's College*, Halifax; *St. Francis Xavier's College*, Antigonish; *St. Dunstan's College*, Charlottetown; *St. Michael's College*, Chatham; *St. Joseph's College*, Memramcook, near St. John's, N. B.; *St. Bonaventure's College*, St. John's, Newfoundland (exempt diocese); and the *College of St. Pierre*, on the *French* island of the same name, under the direction of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost.

In the *Province of St. Boniface* the following: The *Seminary and College of St. Boniface*, embracing classical and theological departments; *St. Albert's College; St. Louis' School*, at New Westminster, British Columbia; and *St. Louis' College*, at Victoria, Vancouver's Island.

CATHOLIC JOURNALISM IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

The first *Catholic journal* published in the United States was *The U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, founded in 1822 by Bishop *England*, of Charleston, S. C., who was its chief editor for twenty years. It was an able exponent of Catholic opinion while it existed, but, owing to the political complications at the South and the breaking out of the war, was unfortunately suspended in 1861. The *Truth Teller* was issued in New York also in 1822, and in 1833 *The Catholic Diary*, both of which have long since ceased to appear. The first number of *The Jesuit* was issued at Boston in 1829; of *The United States Catholic Free Press* at Hartford in 1830; and of *The Catholic Telegraph* at Cincinnati in 1831. The first two have been many years suspended, and the last is therefore the oldest Catholic paper in the United States. It was founded by the saintly Bishop Fenwick, O. S. D., and has been at all times an uncompromising, though temperate advocate of Catholic truth. The Very Rev. *Edward Purcell*, a forcible and elegant writer, of whom Dr. Brownson once said that if his fugitive verses were collected, they would form a volume of the finest poetry in the language, was for many years its editor-in-chief.

The Boston Pilot, the second oldest, and at one time the most widely circulated Catholic paper in the United States, was founded in 1837. Its tone has been consistently and uniformly one of loyalty to the Church and of fidelity to the interests of Catholic Irishmen, who owe to it a deep debt of gratitude. In the year 1837, the same in which the controversy between Bishop Purcell and Alexander Campbell took place, the first German Catholic weekly published in the United States was issued at Cincinnati. This was the *Wahrheitsfreund*, founded by the Rev. *M. Henni*, now Archbishop of Milwaukee. This paper is at present under the control of the Benziger Bros., has a large circulation, and is warmly devoted to the cause of Catholicity and to the interests of the Germans of the Northwest. The *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* of New York, founded nine years later, and ably edited by *Maximilian Oertel*, was at one time very widely circulated.

The New York Freeman's Journal, published at New York, was founded in

Hosted by Google

1840, and has been edited since 1847 by Mr. *James A. McMaster*, a vigorous and at times intemperate writer, but an uncompromising champion of the rights of the Church and the prerogatives of the Holy See.

The Pittsburgh Catholic was founded in 1844 by the learned Bishop O'Connor, and has ever since reflected the piety and ardent attachment to Catholic principles that characterized its first editor. In the same year the first number of the *Propagateur Catholique* of New Orleans appeared, and is now published in both English and French.

The Catholic Mirror, the official organ of the province of Baltimore, was first issued in that city in 1849.

In 1857 the *American Celt*, after it had existed for five years, was superseded by the *New York Tablet*, which is still prospering, and is an able and temperate defender of Catholic truth, though apparently too much of an advertising medium for its publishers.

The *Katholische Volkszeitung* of Baltimore, which has the largest subscription list of any German Catholic paper in America, and the *Katholische Wochenblatt* of Chicago, which is unusually enterprising in placing early news before its readers, were both founded in 1860.

The *Ave Maria* (magazine), founded in 1865 by Very Rev. *E. Sorin*, C. S. C., at Notre Dame, Ind., was for a time edited by the late Father Gillespie, and in 1866 received an approbation from the Holy See.

The *Katholischer Glaubensbote* of Louisville, and *The Catholic Standard* of Philadelphia were both founded in 1866, the first editor of the latter being the Rev. *James Keogh*, D.D. This paper, at present edited by Mr. *G. D. Wolf*, has been specially enterprising of late, and is now in the front rank of Catholic journals in the United States.

The New Orleans *Morning Star*, one of the most widely circulated of Southern journals, appeared in 1868, and *The Louisville Advocate* was revived for the third time in 1869, but is again suspended.

The Irish World, founded at Brooklyn, New York, in 1870, by Mr. *P. Ford*, is an independent and intemperate advocate of everything Irish, and, by its reckless and heated denunciations, has done infinitely more harm than good to the Catholic cause.

The Catholic Review of New York and Brooklyn, founded in 1872 by its present editor, Mr. *P. V. Hickey*, is thoroughly Catholic in principle, dignified in tone, and in literary merit of exceptional excellence.

Among the Catholic weeklies that have most recently appeared are *The Catholic Temperance Abstinence Union* of New York; the *Hartford Catholic; The Lake Shore Visitor* of Erie (1873); *The Ohio Waisenfreund* (1873); *The Catholic Universe* of Cleveland, founded by Bishop *Gilmour* in 1874; *The Chicago Pilot; The Catholic Columbian* of Columbus, O., founded in 1875 by the Right Rev. *S. H. Rosecrans*, its chief editor, whose brilliant and condensed paragraphs frequently suggest more matter for thought than the editorials of most writers; *The Illustrated Weekly* of New York, founded by Colonel *McGee* in 1876, and as a rule a most creditable production.

All the papers enumerated above are *weeklies*.

There are only two Catholic newspapers issued *daily* in the whole of the North American Continent, namely, the *Nouveau Monde* of Montreal, Canada;

Hosted by Google

and the *America* of St. Louis, Mo., U. S.; the former published in French and the latter in German.

The first Catholic newspaper published in English in Canada was *The Montreal True Witness*, founded by Mr. *Clerk* in 1850. This was followed by *The Morning Freeman* of St. John's, N. B., an excellent paper; by *The Irish Canadian* of Toronto, founded by Mr. *P. Boyle*, its present editor, in 1863; and by *The Tribune* of Toronto, founded in 1874, both of which are sterling Catholic journals.

The U. S. Catholic Magazine, started in 1842, and suspended in 1849, was the first *monthly* periodical of marked ability that appeared in the United States, and was, during the term of its existence, under the editorial management of Rev. Dr. *Charles White* († 1878) and Rev. Dr. *M. J. Spalding*.

The Metropolitan of Baltimore, the first number of which was issued in 1853 and the last in 1858, though not so solid as the magazine, was more acceptable to a larger class of readers.

The Catholic World of New York, founded in 1865 by the Very Rev. *I. T. Hecker*, C. S. P., is the ablest, as well as the most successful monthly that has yet appeared in the United States, and will compare favorably with those of any other country.

The Catholic Record of Philadelphia, founded in 1871, though modest in appearance, is ably edited, and contains some instructive and charming articles. Its tone, too, like that of the *Catholic World*, is heartily Catholic.

Among the German Catholic monthly periodicals are the *Pastoral-Blatt*, published at St. Louis, and founded in 1866; the *Alte und Neue Welt* (illustrated), founded in 1866, and published by the Benziger Bros.; the *Katholische Missionen* (illustrated), founded in 1873, and published at St. Louis by B. Herder; and the *Deutscher Hausschatz in Wort und Bild*, founded in 1874, and published by F. Pustet.

Brownson's Review, the first series of which extended from 1844 to 1864, and the second from 1873 to 1875, was certainly the ablest Catholic quarterly that has yet appeared in the United States; and although exception was taken to some of the utterances of its editor, he was never accused of conscious disloyalty, either to the spirit or the letter of Catholic teaching, and in the last pages of the last issue of his great Review, submitted all he had ever written, with the humility and docility of a faithful son of the Church, to the judgment of the Holy See († April 17, 1875).

The American Catholic Quarterly of Philadelphia was founded in 1876, with Dr. *Corcoran* as its chief editor. Among its contributors are some of the ablest ecclesiastics of the Church in America, and many distinguished foreigners. It would be venturing too much, however, to say that it has as yet realized the high hopes its appearance inspired, or that all its contributors are quite up to the standard required in a first-class English Catholic Quarterly.

From the above brief outline it will be seen that there are quite as many newspapers and periodicals in the United States, considering the Catholic population, as in any other country of the world; but it must be added that among all the weekly journals there is not one that can fairly be called a model Catholic paper, or that, as a reliable vehicle of Catholic news or an able and dignified exponent of Catholic opinion, at all approaches the English weeklies.

Hosted by Google

MEXICO.

The *United States of Mexico*, once the Empire of the Aztecs (*Mexitli*), after a long struggle, frequently interrupted, and as often renewed, between the years 1810 and 1824, finally became independent of Spain, and, as originally constituted, consisted of nineteen States and five Territories. The population of Mexico is mainly made up of Spaniards, Creoles, Mestizos, and Indians. The Catholic Church, which is the only one recognized by the government, enjoyed comparative prosperity until the latter half of the eighteenth century, when it became evident that a storm was approaching. As usual, the first visitations of its fury fell upon the *Jesuits*, who, though they had either conferred or brought greater blessings upon the country than any other body of men, were *banished* in 1767, and their property confiscated. As *Wolfgang Menzel* very justly remarks, the sweet peace and childlike contentment of the inhabitants were disturbed by the introduction into the country from Europe of a *false philosophy* and the revolutionary principles of European Freemasonry. Fascinated by the siren voice of liberty, they pursued it as a phantom, and finally woke to the stern conviction that the hopes it inspired were delusive and its promises a snare.

Few men have deserved better of the country than *Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana*, Patriarch of the Indies, and formerly Archbishop of Toledo († April, 1804), who presided over the Fourth Provincial Council of Mexico, in either 1766 or 1771.[1] From the day the Mexicans became politically an independent people they have been a prey to unceasing intestine dissensions, and have at length lapsed into a state of almost hopeless anarchy. Since then the government of the country, whose chief executive bears the title of President, has passed alternately into the hands of one of the two dominant political parties of Freemasons, the *Escosesos*, or Centralists, and the *Yorkinos*, or Federalists.

By the Constitution of 1824, which, with the exception of the article relating to religious freedom, was little more than a transcript of that of the United States, the Catholic Church was declared to be the only one tolerated by the Confederacy. In the course of the years 1824 and 1825 a friendly correspondence was carried on with regard to ecclesiastical affairs between Pope Leo XII. and President Victoria. During the ascendancy of the Democratic government of the Yorkinos, bishoprics falling vacant were not filled, and in 1829 there was but a single bishop in all Mexico. This condition of things led to the conclusion of a Convention with the Holy See, which was proclaimed on the 16th of May, 1831, as a fundamental law of the State. Naturally enough, it was opposed by the Spanish Court, which still claimed the right of presenting to bishoprics, and for similar reasons by the Liberals, but was sustained by the Mexican government. Under the presidency of Santa Anna (from 1833), Congress passed laws suppressing convents and abolishing the compulsory payment of tithes; and it was proposed to confiscate the property of the Church, and appropriate it to the payment of the national debt. These measures roused the indignation of the people, who were at heart still warmly attached to the

[1] *Wittmann*, l. c., pp. 191–212; *Gams*, Vol. II., pp. 49–56, and Vol. III., pp. 674 sq.

Hosted by Google

Church and the Holy See, and uprisings took place, which resulted in 1835 in the abrogation of the Constitution of 1824 and the concentration of all political power in the hands of Santa Anna. This usurpation was resented by *Texas*, which declared itself independent of Mexico in 1836, and nine years later was annexed to the United States; and by Upper California and New Mexico, both of which seceded from the Mexican Republic in February, 1848. *Herrera*, who succeeded Santa Anna as President in 1848, endeavored to adjust the differences between Church and State, and to have a Nuncio appointed for Mexico, but without success. The latter measure, which had been in contemplation during the lifetime of Gregory XVI., was brought to a successful issue in 1851, under the presidency of *Arista*, but had little or no influence on the relations of political parties in the country. Mgr. Clementi, the Apostolic Delegate, failed to inspire confidence or to attract to himself the unwavering sympathy of any party;[1] and the negotiations preparatory to the conclusion of a Concordat with the Holy See came to an abrupt termination in 1853, when Arista was driven from power, to be succeeded in the following year by Santa Anna, under whom the condition of the Church became still worse.

In an allocution of December 15, 1856, Pope Pius IX. complained that by the enactments of that and preceding years ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been declared void, the Church despoiled of her estates and possessions, the Bishops of Puebla and Guadalaxara exiled, religious encouraged to quit their monasteries, and other steps taken by the government highly detrimental to the interests of religion. Santa Anna was succeeded in the presidency by *Alvarez* in 1855, but, after a short absence from power, again became chief magistrate for the third time, only to give way to General *Comonfort* in 1856, under whom the Church was more bitterly persecuted than even under Santa Anna himself. The result of this hostility to the Church was an insurrection, which placed General *Zuloaga* at the head of affairs in 1858. In a letter, dated January, 1858, Zuloaga assured the Holy Father that the Mexicans had always regarded loyalty to the Holy See as their first and highest duty, and deeply regretted the persecution to which the Church had been subjected; that, though the recent enactments against the freedom of the Church and the laws confiscating ecclesiastical property might lead him to believe that the bulk of the inhabitants had abjured the faith of their ancestors and grown hostile to the Holy See, such was not in matter of fact the case; that the abrogation of the offensive statutes had given sincere and universal joy to the nation; and that His Holiness might rest assured that harmony between Church and State was now fully restored.[2] Had Zuloaga remained at the head of affairs, he would have pursued a policy certainly friendly, and possibly highly favorable to the Church; but having been driven from power in 1859, he was unable to carry out his conciliatory measures. In a second allocution, dated September 30, 1861, Pius IX. again protested against the iniquitous laws, directed, not alone against the authority, but also against the teachings of the Church. He complained that ecclesiastical estates had been declared national property and confiscated; that churches had been plundered; that priests, religious, and nuns

[1] *W. Menzel*, Hist. of Our Own Days, Stuttgart, 1860, p. 318.

[2] *Freiburg Kirchenblatt*, 1858, pp. 157 sq.

Hosted by Google

had been treated with indignity; and that bishops, after having been subjected to all manner of outrage, had been expelled the country.[1]

Most of the exiled bishops took up their residences in Rome, and, on their representation, the Pope made a new division of the dioceses of Mexico, many of which were excessively large. This measure was made public in an allocution of March 16, 1863.[2] The hopes of the friends of the Church revived when, on the 10th of July, 1863, the Assembly of Notables, by a vote of 250 against 20, declared in favor of an hereditary monarchy under a Roman Catholic Emperor. The crown was offered to Maximilian of Austria, who landed at Vera Cruz May 20, 1864, and entered the Mexican capital on the 12th of the following June, under the title of *Maximilian I.*, Emperor of Mexico. Maximilian was reputed to have been the most accomplished prince of Europe, and his misfortunes in Mexico are to be ascribed to the rashness of his friends, the duplicity of his patrons, and the unreasonable and persistent hostility of his enemies, rather than to any lack of ability on his part or to any antagonism of the religious principles by which he was guided, with the legitimate aspirations of a people desirous of being great and free. Directly on his arrival in the City of Mexico, the clerical party demanded the immediate and unconditional restoration of the ecclesiastical property confiscated and sold during the ascendancy of Juarez and the French regency. As this amounted to about *one-third* of the real estate of the Empire and *one-half* of the immovable property of the municipalities, and had already passed from the first to the second, and in some instances to the third purchaser, it was plainly impossible for the Emperor to satisfy this demand. When Mgr. *Meglia*, the Papal Nuncio, avowed his inability to find any satisfactory solution of the question, Maximilian threw himself into the arms of the liberal party, and on the 27th of December, 1864, instructed his ministers to bring in a bill, which was immediately passed by the chambers, vesting the management and sale of ecclesiastical property in the Council of State.

In the meantime Mgr. Meglia resigned his position, May 27, 1865; and a committee, followed some time later by Father *Fischer*, was sent to Rome to adjust matters, but before anything could be accomplished the Empire had ceased to exist. At the demand of the United States government, which peremptorily refused to recognize Maximilian, the French troops, under Marshal *Bazaine*, were withdrawn early in 1867. The Emperor was, in consequence, left to contend at fearful odds against the republican General *Escobedo*, and, after a series of disasters, was finally made prisoner at Queretaro on the 15th of May, 1867, and on the 19th of the succeeding June he, together with his two generals, *Miramon* and *Mejia*, was shot.

Juarez re-entered the City of Mexico July 16, and was elected President in the following October. He was the first of the Mexican presidents to serve the full term of his office. He died in 1872. The triumphs of the Republic, however, did not put an end either to civil war or religious persecution, and in 1875 severe laws were again enacted against the Church.

According to the Gotha Almanac, the population of Mexico in 1868 was

[1] *Moy*, Archives of Canon Law, 1862, Vol. VII. (I.), p. 117.

[2] Cf. *Moy*, Archives, 1863, Vol. IX. (III.), p. 433 sq.

Hosted by Google

8,259,000, which, with the exception of about 100,000 infidel Indians and a few strangers, is entirely Catholic. In 1848 there was one metropolitan and eleven suffragan sees and 1,235 parishes in the whole country, which is about six times the size of Italy. The number was manifestly insufficient, and, as has been mentioned, Pius IX., in 1863, divided the country into three ecclesiastical provinces, and established six new bishoprics. The following is the present ecclesiastical organization:

I. Metropolitan see: *Mexico.* Suffragan sees: Victoria, Puebla, Chiapa, Oaxaca, Yucatan (or Merida), Vera Cruz, Chilapa, and Tulancingo.

II. Metropolitan see: *Michoacan* (with seat at Morelia). Suffragan sees: San Luis de Potosi, Querétaro, Leon, and Zamora.

III. Metropolitan see: *Guadalaxara.* Suffragan sees: Durango, Linares (with seat at Monterey), Sonora, and Zacatecas, and the Vic. Ap. of Lower California.[1]

In former times, each Cathedral had its chapter, where, according to an enactment of the Third Provincial Council, held in 1585, there should be a dean, an archdeacon, a chantor, a theologian, a treasurer, ten canons, six prebendaries, and six ecclesiastics, with competent revenues.[2] By permission of the Holy See, granted in 1830, the Chapters propose three candidates for a vacant episcopal see; of these the government selects one, upon whom the Pope confers canonical investiture.[3] As long as Mexico was a dependency of Spain, the bishops exercised the same jurisdiction, and were subject to the same limitations as those of the Mother Country, where the Canon Law of the Church was in force, but under the Republic their condition was wholly changed.[4] During the same period the bishops had very handsome revenues, the largest being about $130,000 or pesos, and the smallest about $25,000; at present the revenues range from $5,000 to $10,000. This is the nominal sum set down in the public budget, but in matter of fact both bishops and priests are supported by the voluntary contributions of the faithful. It is estimated that there are at present about 10,000 priests in Mexico, 3,223 of whom are secular clergy. They are educated in the older diocesan seminaries and in monasteries, and, since the expulsion of Spanish ecclesiastics by President Guerrero, are mostly Indians. Although only moderately educated, they are exemplary and zealous in the discharge of their duties.[5]

No class of men have done more for Mexico than the *Religious Orders*, and none have been more shamelessly and ungratefully treated by the Republican government. The Jesuits were banished by the Spanish government first in 1767, and their colleges, convents, and great wealth declared confiscated to the Crown; and were again similarly dealt with by the Republic. The Franciscans, Augustinians, and Dominicans, though never formally suppressed, were despoiled of all their property.

In 1810 there were 149 convents in Mexico, containing 1,931 monks, and

[1] *Moy,* Archiv. 1863, Vol. IX. (III.), p. 433 sq.; *Gerarch. Catt.*, 1877, pp. 53, 54, 62.

[2] *Moroni,* Vol. II., p. 14.

[3] *Gams,* l. c., p. 683.

[4] Conf. *Hergenröther,* The Negotiations of Spain with the Holy See, in Moy's Archiv., Vol. X. (II.) sq.

[5] *Merz,* l. c., Vol. VII., p. 138.

Hosted by Google

distributed into thirteen provinces, six of which belonged to the Franciscans, three to the Dominicans, two to the Augustinians, one to the Carmelites, and one to the Mercederians. There were at the same date six missionary colleges, containing 329 students.[1] The capitalized value of the property belonging to the Religious Orders was between nine and ten millions of pesos.[2] In 1845 there were 150 convents of men, 68 of which belonged to the Franciscans, 25 to the Dominicans, 22 to the Augustinians, 19 to the Order of Mercy, and 16 to the Carmelites;[3] and in 1856 there were 146 convents and 1,139 monks. The entire property of these Religious Orders was confiscated by President Comonfort. In 1860 the Recollect Franciscans possessed 30 religious houses, the Dominicans 25, the Augustinians 10, and the Carmelites 10, while the Jesuits were established at Mexico; the Oratorians at Mexico, Puebla, and Guadalaxara; the Benedictines at Mexico; and the Brothers of Charity at Mexico and Oaxaca.

In 1810 there were 57 convents of women in Mexico, containing 1,962 inmates; in 1845, 50 convents and 2,000 religious; and in 1856, according to the testimony of Baron von Richthofen, 39 convents and 3,160 religious. All Orders of female religious were suppressed by act of government in 1863; the Sisters of Charity, who had been introduced into the country from Europe about 1845, being the only religious community of women recognized.[4]

There is but one University[5] in the country, that of the City of Mexico, founded in 1551, having 22 professors and a library of 50,000 volumes.

There are colleges in every considerable town, 35 of which are under ecclesiastical supervision, besides 37 seminaries and 2 high schools or lyceums, situated at San Luis Potosi and Guanajuato.

Primary schools do not exist except in the larger cities, which, it is said, is due more to republican misgovernment than to the neglect of the clergy, who are not permitted to exercise their energies in this field. Between the years 1822 and 1850, what is known as the Bell-Lancaster System of Mutual Instruction[6] was introduced by the Director General of Primary Instruction, with a view to educate the people out of what was called by euphemism their "fanaticism."

The Emperor Maximilian designed to introduce a complete and thorough system of public instruction, and to raise the standard of studies to that of the best schools of Europe, but time was not given him to carry out his benevolent and enlightened purposes.[7]

Almost every town has its orphanage, its house of refuge, and its hospital; there are numerous confraternities;[8] and the greater feasts of the Church are celebrated with unusual pomp and splendor.[9]

[1] *Gams*, l. c., p. 677.
[2] The *same*, p. 679.
[3] The *same*, p. 689.
[4] *Salzburg Kirchenblatt*, 1863, p. 158.
[5] Cf. *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. 52, p. 949.
[6] *Gams*, l. c., p. 862.
[7] *Salzburg Kirchenblatt*, 1865, p. 268.
[8] The *same*, 1863, p. 315.
[9] *Merz*, l. c., p. 139.

Hosted by Google

While the standard of religion and morality is confessedly low among the Mexicans,[1] the religious sentiment of the people, though perverted, is deep and universal; their charity, whether public or private, according to the testimony of the notorious Calderon de la Barca, is without a parallel in the world; and in mental endowments they are not surpassed by any other people. With peace and good government, they would, there is hardly a doubt, take their place among the foremost nations of the earth.

CENTRAL AMREICA, which, since 1525, had been subject to Spain, after a protracted and obstinate struggle, lasting from 1815 to 1823, became finally independent, and formed a Federal Republic, comprising Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, with a total population of 2,665,000. A civil conflict, however, continued to rage between the Monarchists and the Republicans until the dissolution of the Confederacy in 1839, during which the Catholic Church suffered severely. In this year *Carrera* became Dictator of Guatemala, the largest of the five Independent Republics; and in July, 1843, the Jesuits, whose labors had brought so many blessings upon that country, and who were still held in grateful remembrance by the people, were recalled by order of the Congress, and the zeal and activity which they still continue to display promise well for the future of the country. Many monasteries were restored and a Concordat concluded with the Holy See in 1852. A Concordat was also concluded with the Republic of *Costa Rica* and a bishopric established at *San José* by Pius IX., March 2, 1850, after this State became independent of the Republic of Nicaragua, to which it had belonged since the dissolution of the Confederacy of Central America. Its population, as officially stated in 1864, was 120,000, of whom 30,000 belonged to San José, where there is a so-called University, with six professors and about 100 students.

The condition of the Church in the republics of *Nicaragua* and *Honduras* is by no means as promising as in Costa Rica. There is an episcopal see at the city of *Nicaragua*; another at *Comayagua*, in Honduras; and a third at *San Salvador*, in the Republic of the same name, but its cathedral was nearly destroyed with the city by an earthquake, April 16, 1854.

In the WEST INDIES[2] there are four archiepiscopal and nine episcopal sees and two apostolic vicariates, distributed as follows: San Domingo (no suffragans), Port-au-Prince, five; Santiago de Cuba, three; Puerto de España, two; Martinique and Basseterre, suffragans of the metropolitan see of Bordeaux, each one; and Curaçao and Jamaica, each an apostolic vicariate. The total population of the West Indies in 1862 was 4,071,022, of whom 3,500,000 are Catholic, and about 500,000 Protestant.[3] There are ecclesiastical seminaries at San Domingo, Puerto Rico, Santiago de Cuba, and Curaçao, but these are by no means equal to supply an adequate number of priests, of whom there is a great lack. Among the Religious Orders, whose labors are most productive of good, are the Jesuits, the Redemptorists, the Fathers of the Holy Ghost and of the Sacred

---

[1] *Kalkar*, l. c., p. 217.

[2] *Jas. Neher*, Eccl. Geog., Vol. III., pp. 401 sq.

[3] *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 715–722.

Hosted by Google

Heart of Mary, and the Christian Brothers; and of females, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, and the Sisters of St. Joseph, St. Maurice of Chatres, and the Sacred Heart of Mary. There are Universities at Havana and San Domingo, some high schools, and many private institutions of learning.

The West Indies are divided into the following four ecclesiastical provinces: San Domingo, Port-au-Prince, Santiago de Cuba, and Puerto de España. The Province of *San Domingo* comprises the eastern portion of the island, which formerly belonged to Spain; the Lesser Antilles, belonging to Spain; and the Virgin Islands. The population of the Island of San Domingo itself is in the neighborhood of 700,000. The Church here was in a tolerably prosperous condition until the date of the declaration of independence (1803), since when, owing to numerous changes of government and incessant wars, ecclesiastical affairs have greatly declined, and between the years 1830 and 1850 there was not a single bishop in the Island. In the *Western* or *French portion*, where the aboriginal Indians were exterminated by the cruelty of the early Spaniards and replaced by slaves from Africa, there is now a Republic of negroes, with the capital at Port-au-Prince. Their conversion was first undertaken by the Dominicans, and subsequently by the Jesuits, who were expelled in 1763. Attempts were made by Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. to improve the condition of the Church in this portion of the island, but with very little success, owing chiefly to the malignant agitation kept up by the Protestants, who received hearty encouragement from their friends in Europe. Bishopries were established in 1862 at Les Cayes, Cape Hayti, Gonaives, and Port-de-Paix, but most of them have ever since remained without incumbents.

In the *Eastern portion*, forming since 1843 the *Dominican Republic*, with a population of 136,500, the Creoles declared Catholicity the religion of the State; and *John Monetti* was appointed to the archiepiscopal see of San Domingo, but was expelled in 1853 through the agency of English Freemasons.

No improvement took place during the ephemeral rule of the Spaniards, from 1861 to 1865, and when they were driven from the island the Spanish bishops were forced to leave with them. An effort was made in 1866 by the Redemptorist Father, Louis Buggenons, to again establish relations between the Republic and the Holy See, but since that time the country has been almost continuously disturbed by intestine struggles. The archiepiscopal see of San Domingo is at present administered by a vicar apostolic.[1]

The prospects of the Church are somewhat more encouraging in the islands belonging to Spain. In *Cuba*, the population of which in 1872 was 1,370,211, of whom 730,750 were whites, 34,000 Chinese and Hindoo coolies, and 605,461 blacks, there is an archbishopric at *Santiago de Cuba* and suffragan bishoprics at *San Cristóbal de la Habana*, *San Juan de Puerto Rico*, in the island of the same name. *Puerto Rico*, with a population of 700,000, of whom 600,000 are Catholics, was by Pius VII., in 1816, made suffragan to the metropolitan see of San Domingo, but is now again suffragan to Santiago de Cuba;[2] and *Jamaica*, with a

[1] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, year 1877, p. 193. (Tr.)

[2] Cfr. *Neher*, Eccl. Geogr., Vol. III., p. 409, and *Gerarchia Cattolica* of 1877, p. 52. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

population in 1871 of 506,154, of whom only 13,101 are whites, has an apostolic vicariate. All things considered, the Church is more prosperous in the *Lesser Antilles*, the most important of which is the Island of *Trinidad*, belonging to Great Britain, than in any other portion of the West Indies. In 1850 the apostolic vicariate of Trinidad was changed into the archbishopric of *Port of Spain* (Puerto de España), the capital, to which the bishopric of *Roseau*, on the Island of Dominica, is suffragan. This ecclesiastical province contains about 340,000 inhabitants, of whom 200,000 are Catholics. There was a provincial council held in 1854. Of the Religious Orders, the most numerous and active are the Jesuits, the Eudists, the Redemptorists, who have been lately introduced, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Clugny, and the Ladies of the Sacred Heart.

The bishopric of *Basseterre*,[1] which replaced the apostolic prefecture of *Guadeloupe*, September 27, 1850, had in 1863 two vicars-general, eighty-five priests, a seminary at the episcopal see, and a Catholic population of 137,000. At the same date the apostolic prefecture of *Martinique* was abolished, and the see of *Fort-de-France*, subsequently transferred to *Saint-Pierre*, established in its stead.[2]

The position of the Church in SOUTH AMERICA, and notably in that portion of it which revolted from Spain, forming now the *ten republics* of New Granada, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Chili, Argentina, Buenos Ayres, Uruguay, and Paraguay, has in recent times been the reverse of encouraging. The bishoprics of *New Granada* were made suffragan to the metropolitan see of *Santa Fé de Bogotá*, and those of *Venezuela* to that of *Caracas*,[3] by *Leo XII.*, and the see of *New Pamplona* was established in 1836 by *Gregory XVI.*, and added to the former province. The Jesuits had been recalled, and the hopes of Catholics had barely begun to revive, when a violent persecution against the Church broke out in New Granada. The Jesuits were once more expelled; ecclesiastical estates, whether belonging to the secular or regular clergy, were confiscated; bishops were forcibly ejected from their sees; and in 1852 President Lopez announced a formal separation between Church and State. In an allocution of September 27, 1852, Pius IX., as chief Pastor of the Church, protested against these hostile enactments, and bestowed special praise upon Archbishop *Mosquera*, who had courageously withstood the assaults of the impious up to the day of his banishment, and died an exile at Marseilles, on his way to Rome, December 10, 1853.

The greatest obstacle to the progress of the Church in New Granada is the new political constitution, studiously elaborated upon the principles of the most radical democracy; to which may be added the blighting influence of an irreligious and immoral press, whose evil effects are only too terribly visible in the

---

[1] Cf. the Bull of Erection, in the Acta Pii IX. and in La France eccl. 1851, p. 703 sq.

[2] Cf. the Bull of Erection, in La France eccl. 1851, p. 697.

[3] To the Archbishop of *Bogotá* are suffragan the Bishops of *Cartagena*, *Santa Marta*, *Popayan*, *Panama*, *Pamplona Nueva*, *Antioquia Medellin*, and *Pasto*; to the Archbishop of *Caracas*, the Bishops of *Merida*, *Angostura*, *Cuyo*, *Colaboza*, and *Barquisimeto*

Hosted by Google

atrocious attempts that are daily made upon human life. In the Republic of *Ecuador*, the Jesuits were likewise recalled, but, as in New Granada, only to be again expelled. Although *Quito*, the capital, is the seat of an archiepiscopal see, to which the bishoprics of *Cuenca*, *Guayaquil*, *Ibarra*, *Riobamba*, *Loxa*, and *Puerto Viejo* are suffragan, the condition of religion is by no means promising.[1] *Maria Anna Paredes*, surnamed the Lily of Quito, who died in 1645, was declared blessed by Pius IX.

The metropolitan see for the Republics of *Bolivia* and *Paraguay* is *Charcas*, with residence at Sucre or La Plata or *Chuquisaca*, to which the following sees are suffragan: *La Paz de Ayacucho; Santa Cruz de la Sierra*, at Misque Pocona; *Cochabamba;* and *Paraguay* or Assuncion.[2] The bishoprics of *Buenos Ayres*, *New Cordova*, and *Tucuman*, in which ecclesiastical life was entirely paralyzed during the dictatorship of Rosas (1835–1852), also belonged to the province of Charcas until the year 1865. After the overthrow of Rosas, relations were once more established with the Holy See.[3]

The labors of the missionaries in *Guiana*, or Guayana, in recent times have been successful and encouraging.[4] Under the name of Guiana is included that stretch of coast lying between the mouths of the rivers Marañon or Amazon and Orinoco, which, having been neglected by the Spaniards and Portuguese, was colonized by the English, French, and Dutch. British and Dutch Guiana each contain an apostolic vicariate, and French Guiana an apostolic prefecture. The Catholic population of all Guiana in 1871 was 90,750, or about one-third of all the inhabitants. Of these, 52,250 belong to *Demerara* or British Guiana, 12,500 to *Surinam* or Dutch Guiana, and 26,000 to *Cayenne* or French Guiana. In *French* Guiana, toward the middle of the last century, Father *Lombard* exhibited a most laudable spirit of self-sacrifice, which was zealously emulated by his successors in the same field of labor, among whom Fathers *Besson*, *Carnave*, *Tourrée*, *Autilhac*, and *Huberlant* deserve special mention. During a terrible epidemic which raged in *Dutch* Guiana, Father *Grove* gave an example of the most heroic Christian charity and unbounded reliance in God; and, at the beginning of the second quarter of this century, Father *Hynks*, a Dominican, achieved unexampled success in his missionary labors among the negroes of *British Guiana*.

But of all the countries once forming the territory of the colony belonging to Spain, *Chili* and *Peru*,[5] notably the latter, have given the most assuring evidences of ardent piety and vigorous religious life. Lima, the capital of Peru, was the home of *St. Rose*, and the see of *Saint Turibius*, the former the first canonized Saint, and the latter the St. Charles Borromeo of the New World. But even in these countries protracted civil wars have had the effect of reducing the number of priests and greatly retarding the growth of religion. In *Chili*, where the *Jesuits* now possess a number of religious houses, they are again actively at work conducting schools and directing souls, with the gratifying re-

[1] *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 700 sq.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 706 sq.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 712 sq.
[4] *Wittmann*, Vol. I., p. 136; *Gams*, Vol. III., p. 722.
[5] *Wittmann*, Vol. I., pp. 157 sq.; *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 707 sq.

Hosted by Google

sults that everywhere attend the labors of these devoted men. There is a normal school at *Santiago*, where teachers are trained for the provincial missions. The suffragan bishoprics of *Lima*, the metropolitan see of Peru, are *Arequipa*, *Cuzco*, *Truxillo*, *Maynas* or Chachapoyas, *Guamanga* or Ayacucho, and *Huánuco* and *Puño;* and of *Santiago*, the metropolitan see of Chili; *Concepcion*, *Serena* or Coquimbo, and *San Carlos di Ancud.*

The Catholic population of Chili, which writers tell us is the most prosperous Republic of the New World, is about two millions, and the Catholic the established Church of the State. The *Araucanian Indians* are for the most part heathen; but since 1841 the Capuchins have had missions established among them with the most encouraging results, and more recently the Jesuits have sent laborers into the same field. The clergy, though not sufficiently numerous, come mainly from upper classes of society, and receive an excellent education, either at the University of Santiago or at one of the missionary colleges at Chiloë, Valdivia, and Concepcion. There is also in Chili an Academy of Sciences; some sixty colleges and academies, at fifty of which instruction is gratuitous; one thousand primary schools, attended by 40,000 children; four hundred intermediate schools; forty-one convents of men and seven of women. The flourishing condition of the schools in this country is due for the most part to the active zeal of the Religious Orders.

The ecclesiastical province of *Buenos Ayres*, as constituted in 1865, comprises, besides the metropolitan see of the same name, the suffragan sees of *Cordova*, *San Juan de Cuyo*, *Parana*, and *Salta*, situated in the Argentine Confederation or the United States of *Rio de la Plata.* The population is about 1,340,000, nearly all of whom are Catholics. There is a University conducted by the Society of Jesus at Buenos Ayres, a greater seminary at Cordova, a lesser seminary at San Juan, a Jesuit college at Santa Fé, and a Franciscan college at Rioquarta. Education is general and compulsory.

The bishopric of *Assuncion* embraces the entire Republic of *Paraguay*, consisting of twenty-five departments, with a population of 1,337,431.

In *Brazil*[1] the work of evangelizing the country, which was going prosperously forward under the *Jesuits*, was interrupted by the persecution of *Pombal*, who had the members of the Society expelled the country with circumstances of exceptional brutality and outrage, and amid the tears of the Brazilians, who were sincerely and ardently attached to these noble missionaries. Fortunately, the *Lazarists* were at hand to enter upon the work the Jesuits were forced to leave off, to whom they proved themselves worthy successors. The people of Brazil, who have never wavered in their attachment to the Holy See, gave a signal proof of their loyalty in the year 1834, when the government declined to recognize the bishop appointed by Rome to the diocese of *Rio de Janeiro.* The whole country, with a population of 11,780,000,[2] all of whom, except about 500,000, are Catholics, constitutes but one ecclesiastical province. *Bahia* or San Salvador is the metropolitan see, to which the bishoprics of *Rio de Janeiro* or

[1] *Wittmann*, Vol. I., pp. 143–156; *Gams*, Vol. III., pp. 191 sq.

[2] So *La Rivista Catolica* of Las Vegas (in New Mexico), in the year 1876, at page 273. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Vol. I., p. 625), from the census taken in 1872, gives but 10,095,978. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

San Sebastian, *Belem* or Pará, *Cubaba* or Cuyabá, *Olinda* or Pernambuco, *San Luiz de Maranham*, *Mariana*, *Goyaz*, *San Paolo* and *San Pedro*, in the province of Rio Grande do Sul, *Diamantino* and *Fortalezza* or Ceara, are suffragan. In all these dioceses, with the exception of three, there are ecclesiastical seminaries; still, owing to the petty annoyances and unwarrantable interference of government, inspired mainly, if not wholly, by the Freemasons, the supply of priests is miserably insufficient. The jurisdiction of the bishops, who are nominated by the Emperor, in virtue of his office of Grand Master of the Military Order of Christ, is very much restricted, and as a rule cathedral chapters do not exist. The Religious Orders are zealous and active, and flourish, in spite of the fierce assaults made upon them by the irreligious portion of the press. The Capuchins, Jesuits, and Lazarists are laboring earnestly to convert the natives, who constitute 150 tribes, live in scattered villages, and belong for the most part to the mixed race of the *Tupis*. The Lazarists have quite a large missionary college at Caraca, in the diocese of Mariana. There is a University at San Paolo, possessing, however, neither a theological nor a medical faculty; two medical colleges, styled Universities, at Rio and Bahia; two faculties of law at Recîfe and San Paolo; and 168 high schools and 2,500 primary schools in the entire country. The Church is wholly excluded from the management of *Public Instruction*, the State claiming and exercising complete control. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, about three-fifths of the population are well instructed in the Catholic faith, and are more prosperous and happy than the inhabitants of other countries in South America under English and Protestant influence.[1]

The Eastern Republic of *Uruguay*, called also Montevideo, from the name of its capital, which formerly formed part of the bishopric of Buenos Ayres, was made an apostolic vicariate in 1848. Its population, which is almost entirely Catholic, was 350,000 in 1863, of whom about 150,000 were foreigners. The apostolic vicar and the prefect of the Franciscans for the missions of South America both reside at *Montevideo*.

Of late years the Catholic Church has been making rapid advances in the PHILIPPINE ISLANDS. There has been a bishopric since 1525 and an archbishopric since 1621 at *Manila*, the capital of the Island of Luzon, and there are bishoprics at *Neo-Caceres*, *Zebu* or the Holy Name of Jesus, *New Segovia*, and *Jaro* or St. Elizabeth.

In AUSTRALASIA,[2] however, the progress of the Catholic missions has been seriously impeded by the opposition of the Methodists; by the suspicion roused in the breasts of the natives on account of the protection afforded the missionaries by the *French* in some of the South Sea Islands, and by the frightful immorality and hideous cannibalism prevalent in these countries. As is natural, from the fact that England's power is here supreme, the bulk of the colonists are Anglicans, who have an archbishopric at *Sidney* and bishoprics at *Adelaide*, *Melbourne*, *New Castle*, and *Perth* in *Australia* or New Holland.

An apostolic vicariate, of which Dr. *John Polding*, an English Benedictine, was the first incumbent, was established in 1835, with jurisdiction over Aus-

[1] *Wittman*, Vol. II., p. 531, quoted by *Kalker*, p. 272.

[2] Cf. Father Charles à S. Aloysio, pp. 104–117.

Hosted by Google

tralia, Tasmania (formerly Van Diemen's Land), Norfolk, and other islands, with a population estimated in 1869 at 2,050,000.[1] To these islands are sent all persons transported from the kingdom of Great Britain, who, having been in former times mostly Irish Catholics, and whose greatest crime was their faith, brought abundant blessings upon the land of their exile. They at once asked for priests, who were sent them, and although their missions were opposed by the British government between the years 1810 and 1820, they contained in 1840 as many as twenty-three priests, two of whom were in the Island of Tasmania and two in the Island of Norfolk. Reformed convicts and fresh immigrants laid the foundations of new settlements, and the Catholics increased so rapidly through the unwearied labors of Dr. Polding and Father Ullathorne, that in 1842 it was found necessary to establish an archiepiscopal see at *Sidney*, in New South Wales, and suffragan bishoprics at *Adelaide*, in South Australia, and at *Hobart Town*, in Tasmania. By 1845 there were 56 Catholic missionaries in Australia, 31 Catholic schools, and 28 churches and chapels; and in the same year the first provincial council was held. So unprecedented was the growth of Catholicity that in 1855 there were in Sidney alone, which then contained 65,000 inhabitants, 20,000 Catholics, fourteen Catholic primary schools, a female academy, conducted by the Benedictine nuns, and a college for boys. The see of *Perth*, in Western Australia, was established in 1845; that of *Melbourne*, in Victoria,[2] in 1847; that of *Victoria*, in North Australia, in 1849; and in 1865 the see of *Maitland* was revived, and those of *Brisbane* and *Bathurst* founded.[3] In 1874 *Melbourne* was raised to metropolitan rank, receiving *Ballarat, Sandhurst, Adelaide, Perth*, and *Hobart Town* as suffragan sees, whilst the metropolitan see of *Sidney* retains those of *Goulburn, Bathurst, Maitland, Armidale, Brisbane*, and *Victoria*. These splendid triumphs were achieved mainly through the Benedictines and Jesuits.[4] In the northern Island of New Zealand the sees of *Wellington* and *Auckland* have been established since 1849, and in the southern island that of *Dunedin* since 1869.

In *Western, Eastern*, and *Central Polynesia* apostolic vicariates have existed since 1853, the missionaries being chiefly engaged in converting the natives of the islands.

In Polynesia the Church is achieving marked success. Of the 3,000 inhabitants of *Uvea*, the principal of the *Wallis Islands*, 2,700 were Catholics in 1855. The missions on the *Gambier Islands* (Mangareva, Akena, Akamaru, and Taravai), conducted by the Priests of the *Congregation of Picpus*, are quite flour-

[1] "Catholic Missions in Australia." (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. IV., in three articles.) †**Ed. Michelis*, The Nations of the South Sea and the Protestant and Catholic Missions, Münster, 1847. Cf. "*The Catholic*," 1848. Missionary Journal, Nros. 18, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 52, and 53. *Gams*, l. c., Vol. III., pp. 745–758.

[2] *Sion*, 1842, Nro. 84.

[3] The first British settlement in Australasia was made in New South Wales in 1788; Tasmania was colonized in 1825, Western Australia in 1829, South Australia in 1834, New Zealand in 1841, Victoria in 1851, and Queensland in 1859.

[4] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, year 1877, p. 56. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

ishing, and promise to become the center of missionary enterprise in this part of the world, the missionaries having already extended their labors to the *Marquesas* and the *Sandwich Islands*.[1] Here, too, as in every missionary country in the world, the *blood of martyrs* has enriched the soil, and will become the seed of the faith. In the Wallis Islands Father *Chanel* was martyred by Muru-Muru, a bloodthirsty chief, May 28, 1841; Bishop *Épalle* was murdered by the savages of the Island of Isabella; and in 1856 Father *Mozzuconi* and eighteen of the crew of the ship *Gazelle* met a similar fate at the hands of these sanguinary islanders. The English volunteered to send a man-of-war to punish the perpetrators of the murders on the Island of Isabella, but the missionaries declined the offer, saying: "*We do not avenge our martyrs; we pray for their persecutors.*"

The missions of POLYNESIA are organized into the apostolic vicariates: 1. Of the *Samoa* or *Navigator Islands;* 2. The *Marquesas Islands;* 3. *Melanasia* and *Micronesia;* 4. *New Caledonia;* 5. *Central Oceanica;* 6. The *Hawaiian* or *Sandwich Islands;* 7. *Tahiti* or the *Society* Islands; and the apostolic prefectures of the *Fiji Islands*, *New Norwich*, and *Labuan* Island, with its dependencies, off the northwestern coast of Borneo.[2]

If there be any one fact, which recent events have brought prominently forward, it is that Europe and America are intent upon carrying their civilization and their intellectual culture to the farthest corners of the globe; and hence the Church has the acceptable duty imposed upon her, in this more than in any former age, of carrying the light of truth and the blessings of religion to the heathen of every land, and of keeping abreast of other civilizing influences, which, unless grounded upon the name and the faith of Christ, can have neither stability nor perpetuity. The rapid progress of the missions of the Catholic Church in these latter years seems to point to the approaching fulfillment of the words of prophecy: "He shall rule from sea to sea, and to the farthest ends of the earth."

---

[1] Concerning the missionary operations in the Ladrones or Mariana Islands and the Caroline Islands, see *Wittmann*, Vol. I., p. 300–330. *Freibg.* Eccl. Cyclop., Vol. I., art. "*Australia.*"

[2] *Gerarchia Cattolica*, 1877, pp. 62, 63. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM.

Bibliography at the head of § 375. *Gieseler*, Review of the Theological Tendencies of the Last Fifty Years, Götting. 1837. By the *same*, Text-book of Ch. H., Vol. V. (from 1814 to the present time), Bonn, 1855. *Hundeshagen*, German Protestantism, Frankft. (1846); 3d ed., 1849. *Schwarz*, Supplements to Actual Theology, Lps. (3d ed.) 1864. *Vilmar*, The Theology of Facts opposed to the Theology of Rhetoric, 2d ed., Marburg, 1856. *Baur*, Ch. H. of the Nineteenth Century (Vol. V.); *Dorner*, Hist. of Protest. Theology, p. 741 sq.; *Kahnis*, Interior Development of German Protestantism since the Middle of the Last Century, Lps. 1860; *Gass*, Hist. of Protest. Dogmatics, Berlin, 1867; *Nippold*, Manual of Modern Ch. H., p. 213 sq. Protestantism in its Self-dissolution, Schaffhausen, 1843, signally Vol. II. †**Jörg*, Hist. of Protestantism during the Last Years, Freiburg, 1858, 2 vols. **Ritter*, Manual of Ch. H., 5th ed., Vol. II., p. 575–601.

SECTION FIRST.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY AND OF THE CHURCH IN GERMANY.

§ 424. *Futile Efforts to Preserve the Symbols of Protestantism.*

Startled by the novel teachings, which the writings of Bahrdt[1] were chiefly instrumental in bringing into existence and making popular, the orthodox Protestants, under the direction of pastor *Urlsperger*, first of Augsburg and subsequently of Basle (1775), formed a Society for the promotion of sound doctrine and true happiness; and a similar Society, for the defense of religion, was formed at the Hague in 1786. In Saxony the letters of *Krug* on the perfectibility of revealed religion, and the writings of *Eck*, in which their author pretended to explain the miracles of the New Testament by natural causes, were both prohibited by law. *Frederic William II.* of Prussia, acting under the advice of his Minister *Woellner*, took still more decided steps to maintain evangelical Protestantism. On the 9th of July, 1788, he promulgated an *Edict of Religion* against the philosophical teachings that had

[1] Cf. § 377, p. 598.

Hosted by Google

found favor with Frederic II., forbidding them to be announced to the people from the pulpit. In 1790 the Consistories were instructed to advance no one to an ecclesiastical position who held erroneous views on the fundamental truths of Christianity or who declined to accept the national catechism. Pastor *Hermes* and Professor *Hilmer*, of Breslau, were associated with Woellner to see that these provisions were carried into effect, and a Board of Examiners was formed in the Superior Consistory of Berlin, with instructions to exact of all pastors, professors, and school-teachers, before entering upon the duties of their several offices, a written declaration that they would carry out the instructions of government. The trial of pastor *Schulz*, of Gielsdorf, and his deposition in 1791, produced quite a sensation. Many works were published on this occasion,[1] the chief topics under discussion being the extent of the binding force of the Symbols and of the jurisdiction of princes in matters of religion.

Frederic William III., on his accession to the throne in 1797, at once abolished the Board of Examiners, and proclaimed that every one should have full religious freedom.

Kant († 1804), viewing the subject in quite a different light, rejected the superficial theology of his age, and in particular denounced its enfeebling influence upon the moral principle. He was from the start the consistent enemy of the popular philosophy of *Steinbart*, which degraded virtue by making it, not something valuable for its own sake, but only a means of acquiring happiness. Kant, on the other hand, aimed at giving a positive value to the moral principle. His works, as they are the beginning, so do they contain the underlying philosophical principles of the rationalistic theology of Germany. After having attempted to establish in his *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) that the human mind is incapable of knowing the highest truths with absolute certainty, he admitted in his *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788) the existence of

[1] *Henke*, Animadversions on all the Writings, occasioned by the Prussian Edict of Religion, Kiel, 1793. See, above all, *Tholuck's* Miscellanea, Pt. II., p. 125 sq., and *Volkmar*, The Trial of Pastor Schulz, of Gielsdorf, Friend of Enlightenment in the Eighteenth Century, Exposed from the Judicial Acts, Lps. 1846.

Hosted by Google

a *moral conscience*, which, he maintained, is the true basis upon which our conviction of the objective reality of a supreme moral law and of a sovereign good, which is the object of this law, can alone rest. In his work, entitled *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason* (1793), he applies to the Church and to the Christian dogmas his purely ethical religious conceptions, which are based solely on the moral law, to the exclusion of all metaphysics. According to his view, religion is only an aid to morality, and Christianity itself a school of morals. Practical Reason, that is, reason within the limits of experience, is the one only source of religion, because it is the basis of the *moral law*, which, in its turn, unlike dogmatic truths, is *alone demonstrable* by reason, and should therefore be universally accepted.

The advocates of pure reason, thus assailed by Kant, did not consider themselves vanquished. *Flatt*,[1] among the theologians, and *Jacobi*[2] († 1819), among the philosophers, at once rallied to its defense. Jacobi's theory was diametrically opposed to that of Kant. Kant admitted only a subjective reality; Jacobi affirmed that there was also an objective reality in such conceptions as God, the soul, immortality, and the like. Kant denied that faith is a source of knowledge in the strict sense to the reason; Jacobi held that there is an *interior revelation* or moral intuition, through which the intellect apprehends metaphysical truths as clearly and as firmly as it does those of experience through the medium of the senses, and that this revelation is the only source of our knowledge of divine things. The *objective realism* of Jacobi, and also the *aesthetical ideas* of *Fries*, exercised a marked influence upon theology. Still the teachings of Kant may be fairly considered

[1] *Flatt*, Essay of a Theory determining the Idea and Principle of Causality, and Laying the Foundation of Natural Theology, with Reference to the Philosophy of Kant, Lps. 1788. Letters on the Moral Foundation of Religious Knowledge, with Reference to the Philosophy of Kant, Tübingen, 1789. Observationes quaedam ad comparandam Kantianam disciplinam cum chr. doctrina pertinentes, Tübing. 1792.

[2] *Jacobi*, Of Things Divine and Their Revelation, Lps. (1811), 1822; Complete Works, Lps. 1812 sq., 6 vols.; Correspondence, Lps. 1825 sq., 2 vols. † *Kuhn*, Jacobi and the Philosophy of His Age, Mentz, 1834. *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 756 sq.

Hosted by Google

the legitimate source of the theological system, which, since the time of *Reinhard*, has borne the name of *Rationalism*, and whose one supreme law is *reason*, or those natural endowments, which being possessed by all men, are regarded as a sort of *natural* revelation from God. Since the death of Kant, his system has found many defenders. Among the ablest of these we may mention *Eckermann*, *Teller*, *Henke*, and *Tieftrunk*; *Roehr*,[1] General Superintendent of Weimar, its popular, and *Wegscheider*,[2] Professor at Halle, its dogmatic apologist; and *Paulus*,[3] Professor at Jena, and subsequently at Würzburg and Heidelberg, who gave to it an exegetical interpretation. Arrogating to themselves the title of champions of science and liberty, these learned but superficial men, by completely ignoring the historical character of divine revelation, and dealing with the Holy Scriptures flippantly and in bad faith, have given a fresh example to the world of the degradation to which reason may be reduced when, setting aside the light of lawful authority, it rises in its pride and becomes a guide unto itself. Their shallow and *coarse* rationalism, which will not accept anything except what falls under the senses and yet pretends to explain all things, while stripping Christianity of its deep meaning, has nothing of its own to offer to intellect, yearning for truths that will not pass away, or to souls languishing for light other than this world can give. "To treat Christianity with such levity," says *Schelling*,[4] "is not to understand, but to misunderstand it; is not to clear up its difficulties, but to brush them aside." And, speaking of modern rationalists, he adds: "They are men of little ability, and yet they are unbelievers; they are destitute of piety, and yet they wear a certain solemn gravity; they resemble those wretched spirits, placed by Dante in the vestibule of the infernal regions, who are rejected of Heaven and shut out from Hell. The one aim

[1] *Roehr*, Letters on Rationalism, Aix-la-Chapelle (Zeitz), 1813, and the Preacher's Critical Sermon-books, fr. 1820. Fundamental Dogmas of the Evangelical Church, Neustadt (1832), 1834.

[2] *Wegscheider*, Instit. theol. christ. dogm., Halae, 1815; ed. VII., 1833.

[3] *Paulus*, Commentaries on the First Three Gospels, 3 vols., Heidelberg, 1830–1833; on St. John's Gospel; Life of Jesus, 2 vols., Heidelberg, 1828.

[4] *Schelling*, Lectures on the Method of Universitary Studies, 2d ed., p. 198 sq.

Hosted by Google

of their 'sound' exegetics, their enlightened psychology, and their tolerant morality seems to be to strip Christianity of all speculative depth and dogmatic truth of all certitude. According to them Christianity is a fact which must be subjected to the tests of history and experience, and its revelation a miracle, which must be explained by the criterions of sense. Now, since divine truth, because of its very nature, can not be either known or demonstrated by experience, the advocates of naturalism are certain to have things all their own way."

But Schelling himself, being an avowed *pantheist*, could not consistently employ such language, and on another occasion he did not hesitate to pen these words: "One can scarcely rid oneself of the thought that the so-called Biblical Books are a great obstacle to the progress of Christianity. And, in matter of fact, their religious teaching can not be compared for excellence with that of many works written both before them and since, and notably with that contained in the Vedas of the Hindoos."

The *Hours of Devotion*, by *Zschokke*, a collection of soothing rhapsodies, published at Argovia from 1809, were at once the most complete and most popular expression of rationalistic exegetics;[1] and the unprecedented favor with which they were received was a melancholy proof of the spirit of indifferentism which everywhere prevailed. Luther had taught that man is justified by faith; here it was asserted that man is justified by *uprightness of conduct*, of which, however, one is to be himself the sole judge, thus fostering in his heart a spirit of pride and self-love.

A reaction, however, soon set in, and the principles of rationalism in religion were promptly met by a *supernatural system, based upon divine revelation*, as *set forth in Holy Writ*, and, in a measure, interpreted by the Catholic Church. The chief leaders, and mainly the defenders of this movement, were *Reinhard* († 1812), *Storr* († 1805), *Schwarz*, *Schott*, *Knapp*, *Tittmann*, and *Steudel*, besides nearly all the older-school

[1] Cfr. Criticism of the *Hours of Devotion*, Vienna, 1824. *Iven*, Anti-Christian Tendency of the Hours of Devotion, Cologne, 1827. The Hours of Devotion, a Work of Satan, by Dr. *G. Christlich*, Soleure, 1818. *Freiburg* Eccl. Journal, 1857 Nros. 5–9.

Hosted by Google

theologians of Tübingen, including *Hahn*, *Tholuck*, and others, who, by putting prominently forward the divinely revealed character of the *historical* Books of the Bible, rendered a valuable service to exegetics.[1] Among these writers Tholuck was especially eminent for his great learning, the theoretical and practical character of his writings, and the influence which he personally exerted. Other theologians, like *Tzschirner* († 1828) and *Bretschneider* labored to bring these two divergent tendencies together, and asserted that "rationalism and supernaturalism could exist harmoniously together without difficulty in the *Protestant* system," which is equivalent to saying that to differ in matters of faith is a dogma of Protestantism.

§ 425. *Influence of Modern Philosophy.*

The philosophical systems of *Schelling*[2] († 1854) and *Jacobi*, that of the former being in its new phase of a *positive philosophy*, pantheistic rather than Christian in its tendencies, exercised in their fuller development a marked influence upon theology. A powerful and permanent impulse was given to these systems by *Frederic Schleiermacher* († 1834), a theologian and philosopher, who received his education with the Moravians or United Brethren, making part of his studies in Upper Lusatia, and completing them at the University of Halle. He is the author of the *sentimental in religion*, and enjoys the questionable honor of having said that "*the different systems of religious philosophy, known as orthodoxy, pietism, and ration-*

[1] *Storr*, Christian Dogmatics, published by *Flatt*, Stuttg. 1803, 2 vols. *Reinhard*, A Course of Lectures on Dogmatics, published by *Berger*, 1801; by Reinhard himself, 1806; by *Schott*, 1818. *Schwarz*, Outlines of Protestant Dogmatics, 1816. *Knapp*, Lectures on Christian Dogmas, according to the Doctrine of the Evangelical Church, 1827. *Hahn*, Manual of Christian Faith, Lps. 1828. *Steudel*, Dogmas of the Protestant Evangelical Church, Tübingen, 1834. *Tholuck*, Doctrine of Sin and Expiation, 1823 sq.; Biblical Commentaries; Character of Rationalist Polemics, Halle, 1840; Miscellaneous Writings, Gotha, 1839, 2 vols.; His Works, ibid., 1862, 4 vols.

[2] *Ritter*, Hist. of Philos., Vol. XII.; *Freiburg* Theol. Journal, Vol. VIII.; *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vols. IX. and X.

Hosted by Google

alism, have each rational grounds of defense." [1] *De Wette* [2] became his colleague, without, however, fully adopting his views. While the character of the teaching of these two men was, on the whole, rationalistic, they remained aloof from Rationalists, properly so called, by whom they were reproached with holding illogical propositions, and being pantheists in disguise. They replied: "You claim that reason is your supreme guide, and you have not yet been able to state scientifically what that reason is or what are its relations to religion." *Twesten* and *Nitzsch*, of Berlin; *Charles Hase* and *Baumgarten-Crusius*, of Jena; *Ullmann*, of Heidelberg; and *Julius Müller*, of Halle,[3] pursued a similar line of thought, all adhering more or less closely to orthodox teaching; while *Marheineke*, Professor at Berlin (†1846); *Daub* and *Rothe*, of Heidelberg;[4] and *Baur*, of Tübingen, were wholly under the influence of *Hegel*,[5] whose philosophy gave tone and color to all they wrote. They particularly admired the Hegelian philosophy, the terminology of which had about it a certain Biblical flavor, "because it made religion the one important thing, the knowledge of which in its essense is the perfection of wisdom; and because it taught that the Christian religion, in its ecclesiastical constitution, has a deeper and wider significance than modern Rationalism is willing to allow." It is certainly strange that men could *so completely* misconceive the true character of Christianity as to fancy that they were able to find its true spirit in the teachings of Hegel, who held

[1] *Schleiermacher*, Christian Faith, according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church, Berlin (1821), 1830 sq., 2 vols. Cfr. *Nippold*, Ch. H. of Our Own Days, p. 213–239, with Bibliography concerning Schleiermacher.

[2] *De Wette*, Hist. Development of Christian Dogmatics, Berlin (1816), 1821, 2 vols.

[3] *Twesten*, Lectures on Dogma, from the Compendium of *de Wette*, 4th ed., 1838, 2 vols. *Nitzsch*, System of Christian Doctrine, Bonn, 1829 sq. *Hase*, Manual of Evangelical Dogmatics (1826), 2d ed., Lps. 1838. *Ullmann*, The Impeccability of Jesus, 6th ed., Hamburg, 1853. *Julius Müller*, The Doctrine of Sin, 1389 sq.

[4] *Rothe*, The Beginnings of the Church and Its Organization, Wittenberg, 1843; Theological Ethics, ibid., 1845–1848, 3 vols.

[5] Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, published by Marheineke, Berlin, 1832, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

that the Reason of *God* is impersonal, and becomes self-conscious only in the intellect of man, thus destroying at a blow both divine and human freedom, leading mankind back from the pure light of the Gospel to pagan darkness, and making *fatalism* (ἀνάγκη) the supreme arbiter of all things. According to Hegel, *evil* becomes necessarily manifest when the soul is occupied in developing its spiritual self-consciousness. Like his other teachings, his *apotheosis of the State* is also borrowed from Paganism.[1]

The essentially anti-Christian tendency of Hegel's philosophy became at once manifest on the death of its author. His disciples divided into two schools, one of which denied outright the facts of Sacred History and even the immortality of the soul; while the other, though still defending some religious truths, did so only because they regarded them as faithful expressions of the mind of their master. The leader of the former school was *David Strauss*, of Tübingen, who had learned his theology from *Baur* and his philosophy from *Hegel*, and who, in his notorious *Life of Jesus*, carried the principles of historical criticism and rationalism, which were the legitimate product of Protestantism, to their last extremes; pronouncing the historical narrative of the New Testament a collection of *myths*.[2] This work, which, though audaciously negative in character, and containing little more than the arguments of so flippant a writer as *Edelmann*,[3] displayed unusual dialectical skill, and challenged the ablest Protestant theologians of the age to the defense of the person of Christ, as set forth in history. Their efforts were not uniformly successful, nor their arguments wholly convincing, and fears began to be entertained that teaching so utterly subversive of Christianity would exercise a most injurious effect upon the masses of believers, when an event took place that checked the current of infidelity. When Strauss was appointed to the

[1] Cfr. *Staudenmaier*, Exposition and Criticism of the Hegelian System, Mentz, 1844.

[2] *Bonn Review*, Nro. 17, p. 250 sq. The Writings on the Life of Jesus, by *Strauss*, in *Rheinwald's* Repertory, art. I. and art. II. of the November nro., 1858. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, p. 826–842.

[3] See § 377, p. 596, note 2.

Hosted by Google

chair of *Christian Dogma* at Zürich, the people rose in open revolt, and forced him to sever his connection with the University and withdraw from the city, thus depriving him of a prestige which such a position would naturally give.[1] The work of Strauss, it would seem, is the last we shall hear of the heresies relative to the Person of Christ, for it is itself a proof that nothing more can be said. Strauss' arguments have not even the merit of originality. His *Christology*, the central point of his dogmatic teaching, coincides literally with that of the Jew *Philo*, who represented Christ and the Logos as mankind, thus bringing the cycle of heresies to a close at the very point at which it started eighteen centuries ago.[2]

While the minds of men were thus straying farther and farther from the central truths of Christianity, there suddenly arose a party of daring thinkers and aggressive innovators, known as the party of *Young Germany*.[3] They changed the errors of Hegel on the development of God in history into a revolutionary and socialistic theory, and, while professing the coarsest Pantheism, advocated, in opposition to the spiritualism of Christianity, the complete emancipation of the carnal passions from all restraints. They gradually lost ground, and finally totally disappeared in the presence of determined opposition, but only to be succeeded by another school of the disciples of Hegel, whose organs were the *Annuary of Halle*, and the *German Annuary*, from 1840, edited by Arnold Rugé, Their teachings, which they defended with a startling disregard of the claims of reason, were closely allied to the theology of *Strauss*, and were, they said, to be erected on the ruins

[1] Cfr. "Dr. Strauss' Call to Zürich" (*Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. III., p. 321–349). *Gelzer*, The Discord occasioned by Strauss' Call to Zürich in 1839. Supplements to the History of Protestantism, Hamburg, 1843.

[2] *Strauss*, Christian Doctrine considered in its Historical Development and its Opposition to Modern Science, Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1840 sq., 2 vols. The Doctrinal Points Alone, in a Popular Exposition, by Philalethes, Constance, 1841 sq. According to Strauss, as well as according to Philo, the *Logos* is *Mankind*, when he said: σύμπαν ἀνθρώπων γένος. De somniis, lib. II. (Opp. ed. Mang., T. I., p. 683.) *Staudenmaier*, Philosophy of Christianity, Vol. I., p. 810–819.

[3] *Heine*, *Gutzkow*, *Laube*, and others. Cfr. *Rheinwald*, Repertory, 1834, Nro. 5.

Hosted by Google

of Christianity, which was forever overthrown. They asserted that the office of the Protestant Church was to destroy faith in the Christianity of the Gospel; that Luther was the forerunner of Hegel, who was immeasurably the superior of the great reformer; and that Protestantism, discarding even the methods of moral discipline and in alliance with *science and culture*, could continue to exist without the Bible, which is, after all, only a bundle of grotesque errors of every sort, sometimes affecting the most vital questions, and should therefore be cast aside as antiquated and misleading. After the failure of *Feuerbach*[1] and *Bruno Bauer*[2] to defend the religious views of Strauss, *Rugé* gave them a political and social application, frankly avowing, notably in his Programme of 1843, that liberalism had grown old and effete, and should be replaced by democracy and communism. *Herwegh*, a poet of Stuttgart, called upon the people "to cast the crosses down and make swords of them."

When this movement, which professed to be only a philosophical and political one, had failed of its purpose, a school of *coarse rationalists*, consisting of the disciples of *Wegscheider*, of Halle; *Schulz*, of Breslau; *Roehr*, of Weimar; and *Paulus*, of Heidelberg, sprung up, assuming the seductive title of *Friends of Enlightenment*. They set forth their teachings in the newspapers and proclaimed them by word of mouth at public meetings, in the hope of regaining among the masses and the so-called "*enlightened*" the ground they had lost on the battle-field of Protestant theology. Skillfully taking advantage of the agitation caused among Catholics by the *Rongian movement*, the principles of which were strikingly in accord with those of the new school, they pushed their claims with vigor and sometimes with success. The preachers, *Rupp*, of Koenigsberg; *Uhlich*, of Madgeburg; *Wislicenus*, of Halle; and *Krause*, of Breslau, who professed a superficial Rationalism and put the most arbitrary interpretation on Scripture, had quite a numerous following. They formed new religious

[1] *Feuerbach*, Essense of Christianity, Lps. 1841. See *Criticism of this work in the *Freiburg Journal of Theology*, 1842, Vol. VIII., p. 151 sq.

[2] *Bruno Bauer*, The Evangelical National Church of Prussia and Science, 2d ed., Lps. 1842.

Hosted by Google

communities, in which not only the Lutheran and Calvinistic symbols were denied, but every shred of *positive* Christianity abhorred and rejected. Of this fact the *sermons* delivered by these apostles, the memorial accepted by the Congregation in charge of Dr. Rupp at Koenigsberg, and the declaration adopted by a *majority* of the representatives of the new communities, to the effect that *the old form of administering Baptism "in the name of the Blessed Trinity" ought to be rejected, and one running in the name of God and of the congregation" substituted*, afford abundant and convincing proof.

§ 426. *The Ultimate Results of the Free Interpretation of Holy Scriptures.*

Putting wholly out of sight the inspired character of the writings of the Bible, and utterly ignoring ecclesiastical teaching, *Semler* was the first to introduce the principle of absolute freedom in the interpretation of Holy Scriptures. Many writers like *Griesbach* (since 1785), *Lachmann* (since 1831), and *Tischendorf* (since 1840),[1] encouraged by the philosophic spirit of the age, employed this method in their works, and particularly in their introductions to the Old and New Testaments, where the authenticity of many of the Sacred Books, especially of the Old Testament, is assailed with shocking levity and a captious refinement of criticism. The Books of the New Testament, which had been vehemently attacked by *De Wette*, notably in his *Introduction*, and by the writers of the modern *school of Tübingen*, were defended by *Guericke*, *Ebrard*, *Thiersch*, *Reuss* of Strasburg, *Bleek*, and others;[2] while those of the Old Testament were defended by *Hengstenberg*, *Haevernick*, *Kurtz*, *Oehler*, *Bleek*, *Delitzsch*, and many more scholars

[1] He died December 6, 1874.

[2] *Guericke*, Materials for an Introduction to the New Testament, Halle, 1829; and Hist. and Crit. Introd. to the New Testament, Halle, 1843. *Thiersch*, Essay of a Critique of the New Testament from the True Historical Point of View, Erlangen, 1845; and A Few Words on the Authenticity of the N. T. Books, against *Baur's* work entitled, The Critic and the Fanatic, Erlangen, 1845. *Reuss*, Hist. of the Books of the N. T., 4th ed., Brunswick, 1864. *Bleek* (Professor of Bonn, † 1859), Introd. to the N. T., Berlin, 1862.

Hosted by Google

of ability.[1] In the domain of philological interpretation, the works of *Ewald*, *Knobel*, *Hupfeld*, *Keil*, *Hitzig*, *Berthan*, and *Thenius*, to mention only a few, have considerable merit. *Winer*,[2] *Fritzsche*, *Meyer*, of Hanover, and in a measure *De Wette*, *Bleek*, and *Holtzmann*,[3] undertook to defend exegetics against the prevalent sceptical spirit of the age, which was especially prominent in the writings of *Dr. Paulus*, of Heidelberg, who attempted to explain away all miracles. These learned men set themselves to the special task of ascertaining by a close study of the *idioms* of the language in which the Books of the New Testament were written, and by the application of the rules of hermeneutics, the precise literal sense of what the writers had said, irrespective of the truth which the meaning conveyed or of its consequences, which, they said, was a question belonging to another branch of theology. *Usteri*, *Rückert*, *Baumgarten-Crusius*,[4] and others, by showing that the Biblical ideas are consistent one with another and

[1] *Hengstenberg*, Materials for an Introd. to the O. T., Berlin, 1831, 2 vols.; the Psalms, Christology of the O. T. (1829), Berlin, 1854, 3 vols.; and the Prophecies of Ezechiel, 1867 sq. *Hävernick*, Manual of Hist. and Crit. Introd. to the O. T., Erlangen, 1836 sq. *Kurtz*, Hist. of the O. T., Berlin, 1853 sq., 2 vols. *Ranke*, Investigations on the Unity of the Pentateuch, Erlangen, 1834 sq., 2 vols. *Oehler*, Prolegomena for the Theology of the O. T. *Bleek*, Introd. to the O. T., Berlin, 1865. *Delitzsch*, Theology of the Biblical Prophecies, Lps. 1845; on Genesis, 2d ed., Lps. 1853; on the Canticle of Canticles, 1851, and on the Psalms, Lps. 1859; on Job, 1864; Isaias. Since 1863 he has been engaged with *Keil* in preparing a complete commentary on the O. T.; several volumes have appeared, and, like most of his works, have been translated and republished in Edinburgh. (Tr.)

[2] Grammar of the Primitive Idiom of the New Testament, Lps. 1822; 6th ed., 1855. *Buttmann*, Grammar of the Primitive Idiom of the N. T., Berlin, 1859.

[3] *Fritzsche*, Evangel. Matth. et Marci recensuit cum comment., Lps. 1826 sq., T. I., II., Comment. in ep. ad Romanos. *Meyer*, Critical Commentary on the N. T., Göttingen (1832), 1846 sq. *De Wette*, Abridged Manual of Exegesis for the N. T., Lps. 1836 sq., in several editions. *Bleek*, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 3 vols.; Synoptical Explanation of the First Three Gospels, 2 vols., publ. by *Holtzmann*.

[4] *Usteri*, Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, 1833; Doctrine of the Apostle St. Paul. *Rückert*, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans; to the Corinthians; to the Galatians. Among the posthumous writings of *Baumgarten-Crusius*, see his explanations of almost all the books of the New Testament, Jena, 1845 sq., 4 vols.

Hosted by Google

hang well together, endeavored to give an explanation of them which would be intellectually satisfactory and commend itself to the reason. Each, of course, had his peculiar way of viewing the subject, but their general drift was the same.

Exegetics in the meantime gained much in truth and dignity from the writings of *Lücke*, *Tholuck*, *Olshausen*, and *Delitzsch*,[1] who sought their inspiration chiefly in the Fathers of the Church and from the arguments brought to light by a study of original texts. *Billroth* announced with classic pedantry "that if exegetics was to be successful in the third *stadium* of its race, it could not ignore modern philosophy," meaning Hegel's, but fortunately no one paid attention to his conceited statement.[2] The Selections from the *Bible, with notes,* commenced in 1858 by *Ritter von Bunsen* († 1860), the well-known diplomatist and theologian, and continued by others, will also entirely fail of its purpose, which is to be a sort of popular book of instruction for the "*Christian Community.*" First of all, it lacks the simplicity and easy grace of style indispensably necessary in such a work; and, again, it is too diffuse to be read by the bulk of the people, who are influenced only by great underlying truths, which are at once essential and incontestable. That this work has unquestionable merit can not be denied; but it is equally undeniable that, in spite of the "*reinstated higher criticism*" of which the author speaks so often and so complacently, and the *philological learning*, which is literally overwhelming, it is a disastrous failure for the purpose which it was specially intended to serve, which was to harmonize Biblical facts with modern ideas. The Bible, with doctrinal and homiletical notes by *J. P. Langen*,[3] assisted by *Schroeder*, *Fay*, *Bähr*, *Zöckler*, *Nägelsbach*, *Lechner*, and other writers, has been more successful.

[1] *Lücke*, Commentary on the Writings of St. John, Bonn, 1820 sq., 3 vols. *Tholuck*, Commentary on the Gospel of St. John; on the Epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews; on the Sermon of the Mount. *Olshausen*, Commentary on the N. T. unto the First Epistle to the Corinthians, inclusively, Königsberg, 1836, continued and finished by *Ebrard*, 1854. *Delitzsch*, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Lps. 1857.

[2] *Billroth*, Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, Lps. 1833, p. X.

[3] *Langen*, Bible, with Notes, O. and N. T., Bielefeld, 1857 sq.

Hosted by Google

§ 427. *The Theology of Compromise and Independent Theology.*

In the midst of these active disintegrating influences a school of theology sprung up, composed of men of eminent ability and high character, who entertained the illusory hope of uniting the conflicting parties by *compromise.* The leader of this school was the learned and amiable *Ullmann*, of Heidelberg, subsequently of Carlsruhe, who was followed in the same line of thought by *Nitzsch*, of Bonn and Berlin, in his *System of Christian Doctrine;* by *Julius Müller*, in his *Doctrine on Sin;* by *Albert Liebner*, in his *Christian Dogmatics from a Christological Point of View;* by *Dorner*, in his *History of the Development of the Doctrine relative to the Person of Christ;* by *Langé*, in his *Christian Dogmatics;* and by Bishop *Martensen*, of Copenhagen, in a work bearing the same title as that of Langé.[1]

Viewing Christianity in the same light as Schleiermacher, not as a body of truths, but as an active creative principle, and regarding the Personality of Christ, or the *Godman*, as its central idea, Ullmann, impelled by a desire to be conciliatory, threw his cardinal tenet into this formula:[2] "*Christianity is divine in essense and human in form; divine in origin and human in development.*" This formula was directly opposed, and probably intended to be so, to the earlier school of supernaturalists, who held Christianity to be in every sense divine, superhuman, miraculous, and, from a historical point of view, inexplicable. These opinions did not meet with unqualified approval, even from Ullman's own followers, and their expression was characterized by rationalists like *Baur*, of Tübingen, as meaningless phraseology, which left all questions precisely where they were before, was calculated to serve no useful purpose, and was wholly illusory and misleading.[3]

Schwarz was still more harsh in his criticism of the opinions of Ullmann, styling them half-truths and useless concessions, and designating the whole system as a dishonest super-

[1] Translated from the Danish into German, 4th ed., 1858.
[2] *Ullmann*, Essense of Christianity, 4th ed., Gotha, 1854.
[3] *Baur*, Ch. H., Vol. V. (19th century), p. 405 sq.

Hosted by Google

rationalism, in that its advocates, whom he characterized as eclectic philosophers, destitute alike of the ability and courage to form a new school,[1] while accepting the general principle of miracles antecedently, were anxious to get rid of them one by one in detail.

The Rationalists were, if possible, still more severe on the *Pectoral Theology of Neander* (*Pectus est quod theologum facit*), who, in his *Life of Jesus*, in reply to Strauss, fell into the glaring absurdity of professing to be a believer while he continued to criticise. The supernatural facts related in his *History of the Church*, it was said, would find a more fitting place in a collection of anecdotes.

The hostility to the advocates of compromise, who, because of their pacific sentiments, were selected by preference to fill chairs in the Universities and high ecclesiastical positions, grew daily more intense and bitter, and was especially directed against the theological faculties of *Göttingen* and *Halle*. It was mainly led by their own disciples, many of whom had grown into orthodox Lutherans. The *new Agenda* or Ritual, which was regarded as Catholic in tendency, and the ecclesiastical discipline introduced by the General Synod of 1855, evoked such a storm among the *liberal* students of Heidelberg that Ullmann was forced to resign his office of President of the High Consistory of Carlsruhe in 1860. Baffled in his plans and disappointed in his hopes, Ullmann ended his laborious life in 1865, while still in the prime of life and the full vigor of his intellectual powers.[2]

Dissatisfied with the theology of compromise, many divines were anxious to assume a more independent attitude, and to the views of such men *Richard Rothe*, of Heidelberg († 1867), gave definite expression in his work entitled "*Theological Ethics*," which, in spite of its title, is dogmatic, rather than ethical in character, it being a methodically developed theological system, containing a strong theosophic element. The chief aim of the work is to replace by *theism* the pantheistic

[1] *Schwarz*, Contribution toward the Hist. of Most Modern Theology, 3d ed., pp. 371, 372.

[2] Cf. *Beyschlag*, Dr. Charles Ullmann, a Memorial, Gotha, 1867.

Hosted by Google

views of the world advanced by Schleiermacher and Hegel. He also gave special prominence to the theory of "*unconscious Christianity*," and offended many by reviving the doctrine concerning the "*merging of the Church in the State*," which, he said, was delivered to the *early Christian Church*. Putting aside the many vague and ambiguous statements of this author, we may sum up his idea of Christianity in his own words, which is that "*it is a pure and perfectly developed humanity, and the kingdom of God an association of religious and moral men*." As to any supernatural influence exercised by the Church on mankind, he does not say a word; quite the contrary, he maintains that humanity was gradually developed by the moral forces implanted by nature in the human race.[1] Between *Rothe* and *J. H. Fichte*, of Tübingen, and *Weisse*, of Leipsig, there was a certain affinity, which was developed by the former in his *Speculative Theology* (1846), and by the latter in his *Speculative Dogmatics*,[2] though neither of them was at all the equal of Rothe in speculative power or perspicuity of style. The leading purpose of Rothe was to prevent the intellectual horizon opened upon the view in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from being again narrowed, and to show that the old teaching concerning the Holy Scriptures and their inspiration; the doctrine of *St. Athanasius* on the Trinity; the definitions of the Council of Chalcedon on the "*communicatio idiomatum*" in the Person of Christ; and the *magical* (sic) effects of the Sacraments and the doctrine of satisfaction, as set forth by St. Anselm, could never again be accepted as convictions by educated men. This same purpose was pursued with indefatigable labor and restless energy by *Baur* and the entire *New School*, which he had formed at Tübingen, and by *Schenkel*, of Heidelberg; but was, however, only preparatory to an ulterior object, which was to assimilate modern philosophy with Christianity, *to abolish the Christian community as the Church of the*

[1] Conf. *Althaus*, The Christ of Rothe (Periodical for Universal Theology and Church, 33d year, Nro. 2); *Von Solms*, Review of Theol. Speculation, according to *Rothe*, Wittenbg. 1872.

[2] 1855–1860, 2 vols.

Hosted by Google

people, and to replace it by another, whose only profession should be a coarse and frigid rationalism, clad in vague and meaningless philosophical and theological phraseology. *Baur* set out by denying the authenticity of the Books of the New Testament, which he said were only a part of the popular literature in vogue in the first century and the early half of the second; and he was soon followed in the same line of argument by *Bruno Bauer*, *Zeller*, and *Schwegler*.[1] This attack he followed up by giving a rationalistic explanation of "Christianity as a religion of purely human origin," a task to which he brought an almost exhaustless store of erudition and a dazzling sophistry. He died in 1860, and was regarded by those who shared his views as second only to Schleiermacher.[2] If Christianity has not been stripped of its divine character, it is only just to Baur to say that it was not his fault. He had a great admiration for *Apollonius of Tyana*, whom he did not hesitate to compare to Christ, but in supporting the comparison it was but natural that he should fail as signally as *Philostratus*, the biographer of Apollonius, had failed before him.[3]

Daniel Schenkel, a native of Switzerland and a pupil of *De Wette's*, was regarded in the early part of his literary career[4] as belonging to the school of the theology of compromise, and on this account, owing mainly to the patronage of Ullmann, was called to fill a chair in the University of Heidelberg. It is said that his alienation from his early associates and his assumption of the character of a champion of Liberal Protestantism were in a large measure to be ascribed to the influence exercised upon his mind by *Bunsen's* work, "*The Signs of the Times*," and by the efforts of *Stahl*, a jurist of Berlin, to establish a hierarchy resembling in many respects that of the

[1] *Bruno Bauer*, Criticism of the Gospel Narrative of the First Three Evangelists, Lps. 1841, 2 vols. Theological Annals, by *Zeller*; Contemporary Annals, by *Schwegler*; Hist. of Montanism (1841), and the "Post-Apostolic Age," 1846, 2 vols., by the same.

[2] Cfr. *Schwarz*, "Materials toward a Hist. of Modern Theology," 3d ed., p. 148 sq., where he also mentions the principal works of *Baur*.

[3] Christ, and Apollonius of Tyana, Tübingen, 1832.

[4] *Schenkel, The Essense of Protestantism*, 1847; 2d ed., 1862.

Hosted by Google

Catholic Church. "Between having my conscience tyrannized over by a despotic authority and obligatory symbols," said he, "and having it emancipated from restrictions and oppression that are alien to Protestantism, my choice can not be doubtful."[1] He, however, stoutly affirmed that his theological convictions had undergone no change, but that the position of the theological schools had been reversed; and to prove his assertion he published his second and more considerable work, entitled *Christian Dogmatics*[2] *from the point of view of conscience*, a title which, aside from its vagueness, was borrowed from Bunsen, his opponent. Many of his theological critics claimed that, not only had he frequently lost sight of his avowed principle of freedom of conscience in treating his dogmatical propositions, but that many of these, instead of being in harmony with the *religious conscience of the age*, were merely reproductions of a theological school, which he himself had branded as antiquated, tyrannous, and enslaving. To escape this imputation he published in 1863 his work "*On the Culture of the Evangelical Theologian*," in which he declared that the Protestant Church has no need of *priests;* that the *church of the people*, as at present constituted, recognizes no distinction of clergymen and laymen; and that, therefore, theologians should be no longer educated with a view to becoming the dispensers of the means of grace, but preachers of the Gospel, instructors of youth, guardians of the poor, and counsellors of those in distress.

The way was now prepared for the publication of his "*Picture of the Character of Jesus, a Biblical Essay*" (1864), which in its essential features is no less radical than "*The Life of Jesus*," by *Renan*, issued sometime before. While denying the Divinity of Christ outright, he takes the airs of one to whom the teachings of Strauss and Renan give offense, and makes an *empty pretense of still believing in miracles.* Such expressions as these are frequent: "Here Doctor Strauss and I part company;" "*I am aware there is a point where reason*

[1] *Schenkel*, Protestant Independence in Her Actual Struggle against Ecclesiastical Reaction.

[2] 1858, 1859, in two vols.

Hosted by Google

must stop (*!*) though our relations to the celestial powers continue uninterrupted;" "Here *faith* begins, *and here, too, I cease to reject miracles.*" But, while professing a general belief in miracles, he was careful, when those of the Gospel came up for discussion, one by one, to utterly destroy, in as far as he was able, their miraculous character, by subjecting them to the tests of rationalistic criticism. He gives a figurative interpretation of the marvelous miracle wrought by Jesus at the marriage-feast of Cana, saying that "Jesus, by the influence of His presence, changed the water of trivial and ordinary conversation *into the wine of elevated and glowing speech.*" He positively refuses to believe in "*the miraculous resurrection of the human body of Jesus*," but still admits that after death He took upon Him a personal glory in a higher and more real condition of existence, and continues in His glorified Personality to exercise an influence upon the body of His disciples.

The ministers of Baden, to the number of one hundred and nineteen, together with all the orthodox Protestant ministers of Germany, entered a unanimous *protest* against the innovations of Schenkel, demanding at least his removal from the office of director of the Preachers' Seminary, to which, they said, he could not himself consistently object, as he had, for a like offense, been mainly instrumental in securing the expulsion of Cuno Fischer from the University of Heidelberg, where he was only a private teacher of *philosophy*. Their protests were without effect. He was sustained by the High Ecclesiastical Council and by the Synod of Carlsruhe, on the ground that his teachings were entirely compatible with Protestantism. This is an authoritative admission that every heresy and the wildest aberrations of the human mind may all find a congenial home in the Protestant Church. But Schenkel was not so leniently dealt with by Strauss, who made him the victim of his "inexorable" criticism. After the appearance of the *Lives of Jesus*, by Schenkel and Renan, Strauss recast his former Life, and reissued it at Leipsig in 1864, under the title of a *Life of Jesus for the German People*, and followed it up with a most scathing and savage pamphlet against Schenkel, entitled *Real Men and Pretenders* (Die Ganzen und die Halben).

Hosted by Google

§ 428. *Revival of Lutheranism—Modern Orthodoxy.*

It was quite natural that the disintegrating tendency of the movement just described should evoke opposition and create a reaction, which, originating in practical religious life, gradually made its way into the field of science. The memory of Luther was revived, and tokens began to appear which pointed unmistakably to the growth of the religious sentiment. As these signs manifested their presence simultaneously in Germany and Holland, in Denmark and Switzerland, in England and in France, it would seem that the movement ought to be regarded as a sort of natural and necessary development.

In the midst of the political convulsions that marked the opening of the present century, *Schleiermacher*[1] reawakened spiritual fervor in the hearts of many; while the *romantic poetry* of the two Schlegels, of Tieck, of Novalis, and others, which carried men's minds back to the days of the Middle Ages and their inspiring and holy influences, and to the generous sacrifices made in the wars of liberation, kindled again the smoldering flame of religion in the breasts of the German people, and warmed their torpid piety to a glow. The centenary jubilees of 1817 and succeeding years, commemorative of the Reformation, served to bring before the minds of Protestants the strong contrast between the lethargy of their religious convictions and feelings and the strong faith and ardent piety of their ancestors. *Claus Harms*, a popular preacher of Kiel († 1855), in whom, it was said, religious feeling gushed forth with all the freshness of water from a mountain spring, was the first to give expression to the sentiments inspired by this revival. A thorough-going Lutheran of the primitive

[1] *Discourses on Religion*, Addressed to Men of Culture, to Arm Them against Her Detractors, Berlin, 1799. *Monologues*, Being a New-Year's Gift to the Educated, Berlin, 1800; 4th ed., 1829. With both of these works form a strange contrast his "Confidential Letters," written at the *same time*, "on Lucinde" (a very obscene Romance by *Frederic Schlegel*), which (in a renewed separate edition by *Gutzkow*, Hamburg, 1835) caused a great sensation, and was the subject of the most diverse criticisms. In his "*Christmas Celebration*," published subsequently (1803), he already manifested his estrangement from the pantheism of Spinoza, and adopted the theological ideas, which he stated later on in his "*Doctrine of Faith*," Berlin, 1821.

Hosted by Google

school, he published, on the occasion of the Jubilee of the Reformation, ninety-five theses, in which he not only repeated the Protestant doctrine of the utter depravation of man after the fall and salvation by faith alone, but rebuked the religious indifference of Protestants, and insisted upon the necessity of returning to the unadulterated teaching of Luther. "I could write on the nail of my thumb," said he, with more truth than irony, "all the positive doctrines that are still believed." His seventy-fifth thesis was directed especially against the *alliance* proposed by Prussia *between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches.* In 1821, when a special Liturgy or "*Agenda,*" containing what was called a "*neutral*" rite for the Eucharist, was granted to the Reformed Church, Claus Harms expressed his indignation in these words: "It is proposed," said he "to bring by marriage a large dower to the Church of Luther, which is regarded as a handmaid. Beware that you do consummate this contract over the tomb where repose the bones of Luther. If you do, he may come to life again, and then woe to you."

The aim of the new school was briefly stated to be "a return from Rationalism to primitive orthodox theology, a going out from the desert of liberal philosophy into the Promised Land of the Reformation." Those who labored most strenuously for the accomplishment of this design in Germany were: *Scheibel*, a professor at the University of Breslau; *Kellner* and *Wehrhan*, Silesian pastors, who sacrificed their positions to their conscientious convictions; *Heubner*, of Wittenberg; *Sartorius*, of Koenigsberg; and *Harless*, a professor at Erlangen, and subsequently General Superintendent for Bavaria, who, apart from the high position he occupied in the Lutheran Church, exercised a powerful influence over the minds of the better classes of men by his writings on *Ethics*, his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, his Theological Cyclopaedia, and the journal entitled *For Protestantism and the Church*, of which he was the founder. The movement soon received another powerful ally in the *Universal Periodical of the Lutheran Church and Theology*, founded in 1840 by *Guericke* and *Rudelbach;* while among the laity *Huschke*, the jurist, and the philosopher, *Steffens*, ably advocated the same cause. It is owing

Hosted by Google

to the influence of these several causes, operating toward a definite end, that the theological faculties of the Universities of *Erlangen*, *Rostock*, and *Dorpat* have recently become strictly Lutheran in their teachings. Since 1825 *Grundtvig* has been laboring with equal zeal and ardor for the restoration of Lutheranism in Denmark, and in consequence was engaged in a spirited discussion with Professor *Clausen*, a devoted disciple of Schleiermacher's, on the questions which were so profoundly agitating the Church in Germany.[1]

In opposition to those who desired the restoration of primitive orthodoxy and the symbols of Luther, there arose what was known as the neo-orthodox school, which, without placing itself in direct antagonism to the old Lutherans, advocated above and beyond everything else a *State religion and a State theology*. As such a theology was necessarily dependent on the religious whims and political views of princes, the Neo-Lutherans saw themselves obliged to change their religion every time they changed their ruler. The leading representative of this school was *Hengstenberg*, who, while attending a conventicle at Basle, in 1823, passed through the interior experience commonly known as "*getting religion*," after which he went to Berlin, where, in 1828, he, together with Schleiermacher and Neander († 1869), received an appointment as State Professor of Theology. He gathered about him a party of *pietists*, who, uniting with the intolerant spirit of Luther the fervid mysticism of Spener, rose rapidly in consideration among people of authority, rank, and distinction at the capital. Without holding any definite creed, Hengstenberg proclaimed himself, in the columns of the *Evangelical Church Gazette*, the champion of Protestant orthodoxy, and branded whoever differed from his views as a heretic, being particularly violent in his denunciation of the rationalistic theologians, *Wegscheider* and *Gesenius*, of Halle, and *David Schulz*, of Breslau. To the reproach addressed to him from many quarters, that his teachings were destroying the confidence which

[1] *Grundtvig*, Theol. Monthly. *Clausen*, On Catholicism and Protestantism, Copenhagen, 1825; transl. from the Danish into German by *Fries*, Neustadt, 1828, 3 vols. Conf. *Jörg*, Hist. of Protestantism, Vol. II., p. 314–356.

Hosted by Google

students had heretofore reposed in their professors, he promptly replied *that if the professor were a rationalist, to repose confidence in him would not be a duty on the part of the Christian student, but a sin.* In 1835 he broke faith with his former allies, who claimed to be "*loyal to their confession*," and became a warm supporter of the Prussian Evangelical Union. For this step he gave these reasons: "The difference," said he, "between the teachings of Luther and those of Calvin on the Lord's Supper are of no consequence; a confession of faith and theology is always sure to bring its own punishment. If the heart be filled with affairs of secondary importance, those of vital interest can find no place in it. And," referring to the Union, he added, "what God has joined ought not be put asunder." His opponents animadverted with caustic severity upon his conduct, reproaching him, among other things, with having "*arrogated to himself the character of a prophet, while he was in truth oscillating between that of a servile political parasite and an ecclesiastical demagogue.*"[1] Still it can not be denied that Hengstenberg and the able and eminent laymen, like *Göschel*, *Henry Leo*, *Gerlach*, *Huber*, and *Stahl*, who shared his opinions and his labors, and whose tone was at times strikingly Catholic, have done much to preserve the divine and positive character of Christianity and its principal dogmas, to maintain Christian morality, to revive religious life, and to counteract the evil influences of freethinkers and Freemasons.

With a view to making a stand against the extreme consequences to which the opinions of Lutherans like *Vilmar* in Electoral Hesse, *Kliefoth* in Mecklenburg, and others, who took their inspiration from the officials of government, were leading, there arose another school, whose representatives, among whom were *Hofmann*,[2] of Erlangen; *Kahnis*, of Leipsig;[3] and *Baumgarten*, of Rostock, demanded that *modern theology* should be subjected to fewer restraints, and that there should be a more unfettered application of the fundamental

[1] *Scwarz*, Materials in Aid of a History of Modern Theology, 3d ed., p. 88.

[2] On this subject he published his *Prophecy and Fulfillment*, 1841–1844, and his *Proof Drawn from Holy Writ*, 1852–1855, 3 vols.

[3] On the Interior Progress of Protestantism, 2d ed., 1860; Dogmatics, 1861; The German Reformation, Leipsig, 1872.

Hosted by Google

Protestant principle of *free inquiry*. Baumgarten had been at one time a disciple of Hengstenberg's, but was subsequently captivated by the mystical and theosophic teachings of Hofmann. Between all these men and *Delitzsch*, the learned commentator, *Kurtz* of Dorpat, and *Luthardt* of Leipsig, there were many points of contact and affinity. Hofmann was sharply rebuked for his arbitrary interpretations of Scripture and his doctrine of *atonement*, which was in direct antagonism to that set forth in the Symbolical Books; while the defection of Kahnis from Lutheranism produced a profound sensation and provoked the bitterest animadversion. "This man," said Hengstenberg, in a tone of angry complaint,[1] "with a hardihood quite unusual among theologians, has dared to raise doubts concerning the authenticity, credibility, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and to assail the Lutheran doctrine of the Trinity and the Last Supper. If one like him, smarting under disappointment, who has gathered from the refuse of Rationalism what he fancied to be sound doctrine, can make converts *among us*, then is our cause certainly hopeless." For a still smaller divergence from orthodox Lutheran doctrine, Baumgarten was deprived of his chair in the University.

REMARK.—In *Niedner's* Manual of Christian Ch. H., ed. of 1866, p. 898–904, and in * *Dorner's* Hist. of Protest. Theol., p. 861–887, a synopsis will be found of the extensive literary works in the different branches of theology, such as *Exegesis;* the *History* of Religion; *Dogmatics*; *Ethics;* Matters relating to *common and higher schools; Ecclesiastical functions; Sacred Poetry;* and *Hymnology*. For a more detailed account of works on *ecclesiastical history* between the years 1825 and 1850, *Engelhardt* may be consulted; and for the years between 1850 and 1860, *Uhlhorn*, in the *Journal of Hist. Theology*, founded by *Illgen*, and continued first by *Niedner*, and subsequently by *Kahnis*, from the year 1850 to 1861. It is a remarkable and encouraging fact that the study of Canon Law has in these latter years been revived, first by *Eichhorn* (1831), and perseveringly cultivated, both as a whole and in special branches, with promising success by Grolman (1832), *Richter* (1841, 8th ed., by Dove, 1867), Bickell, Otto Mejer (3d ed., 1845), Bluhme (1858, 2d ed., 1868), *Wasserschleben*, Dove, *Hinschius*, Friedberg, Waitz, Roth, Hübler, and Sohm.

After the appearance of the works of *Augusti*, *Rheinwald*, and *Boehmer* (see Vol. I., p. 20, n. 2), considerable additions were made to the science of *arch-*

[1] In the New Year's number of his Ecclesiastical Journal for 1862.

Hosted by Google

aeology by *Piper* in his *Monumental Theology*, preceded by an Introduction, and published at Berlin, 1867.

§ 429. *The More Important Religious Movements of Germany.*

(*a.*) IN PRUSSIA.

1. The steadily increasing danger to Protestantism, resulting from divergencies of opinion so various and conflicting, upon subjects so vital and essential as the faith of a church and its authoritative expositions, set Protestants to thinking, and caused them to long for union among themselves.

Between the years 1798 and 1817, and again between 1817 and 1829, and from that day to this, the Royal House of Prussia has labored unceasingly to bring about a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. In a cabinet order of July 18, 1798, the hope was expressed that the two confessions, if they could not unite in doctrine, would at least adopt a common liturgy. This project miscarried, owing to the influence of political events and the determined opposition it met with from theologians. In the royal edict of Frederic William III., addressed to all the Consistories, Synods, and Superintendents of his kingdom, ordering the celebration of the third centennial jubilee, it was stated, though hardly meant, that the very idea implied by the Reformation and the spirit evoked by Protestantism *were in themselves sufficient bonds of union*. There was, it was said, no thought of transforming the Lutheran into the Reformed or the Reformed into the Lutheran Church, but simply to form of the two *one evangelical church, in which the spirit of their founders should be renewed!* Notwithstanding that no formulary could be devised sufficiently elastic to embrace both these branches of Lutheranism without destroying some portions valued by each, the idea of union on some basis daily gained ground. The Union was first realized by the ministers resident at Berlin, whence it made its way slowly into other countries, and was accepted in Rhenish Bavaria in 1819, in Würtemberg in 1820, and in Baden in 1821. In 1822 a *Liturgy* or *Agenda* was published by royal authority for the use of the Court Chapel and Cathedral Church of Berlin, and its general adoption recommended. From a cabinet order of May 28, 1825, we learn that 5,343 churches, out of 7,782, complied with the King's request, and introduced the Liturgy. It was, however, soon assailed on the ground that it tended to mix up the affairs of the State with the affairs of the Church, and that it was antiquated both in matter and form, and contained a strong element of Catholicism. A heated discussion followed, some contending "that the Union was the natural result of advanced culture, and not the arbitrary work of the will of men," an assertion of which *Schleiermacher* claimed he had furnished abundant proof in his *Exposition of Faith;* while others denounced the frequent changes of doctrine on the *Lord's Supper* and *Predestination*, and characterized the Union as a merely exterior and meaningless act, having no foundation other than that of torpid indifference. A revised edition of the Liturgy, which appeared in 1828, containing

Hosted by Google

supplements adapted to the local peculiarities of Pomerania, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Silesia, had the effect of temporarily suspending the discussion.

Nevertheless, the agitation against the Union, started by *Claus Harms*, was continued by *Scheibel*, *Kellner*, and *Wehrhan*, in *Silesia*, and by Guericke, Rudelbach, and others, in *Saxony*. In Silesia the opposition was put down by an armed force, headed by the orthodox *Dr. Hahn*, who was subsequently appointed Superintendent-General. *Dr. Hengstenberg* reproached his former colleagues with advocating an exclusive and bigoted form of Lutheranism, comparing their course to that of men who had suddenly awoke after a sleep of three hundred years.[1] The quarrels thus introduced among the orthodox Lutherans and the severe measures taken by Frederic William III. to repress the opposition of the "*rebels*" continued to retard the work of Union, and in the meantime the King died "*in trouble*" (1840), but not until he had made Protestants and Catholics alike feel the full weight of his despotism.

2. From his successor, *Frederic William IV.*, both Churches looked confidently forward to a more liberal policy, and their hopes were not disappointed. Personally the King was well disposed toward the oppressed Lutherans, and the abortive attempt made by him, in concert with the Archbishop of Canterbury, to establish the Anglo-Prussian bishopric of St. James in Jerusalem[2] also operated in their favor, it being very generally condemned in Germany.

The Archbishops of Cologne and Posen, together with a number of Old Lutherans, who had been cast into prison by his father, were now set at liberty by order of Frederic William; and, with his permission, granted July 23, 1845, a number of Lutheran *Separatist Churches* were organized. As a further step toward granting the Lutheran Church liberty to govern itself, the King convoked a *General Synod*, to convene at Berlin August 29, 1846, consisting of thirty-seven representatives of the clergy and thirty-eight of the laity, under the presidency of the Minister of Worship. The subjects brought forward for deliberation, which were first distributed to eight Committees and discussed in sixty Plenary Sessions, were the following: (*a.*) *Union.* The report on this subject was made by Julius Müller, of Halle, and a resolution carried to the effect that the *consent* of the parties was the only legal basis for "the establishment of an Evangelical Church. (*b.*) *Creed*, or the obligation of the clergy to make some confession of faith. This subject was reported by Nitzsch, of Bonn, who proposed that a formulary, which had been drawn up, and consisted of extracts from Holy Scripture, but contained no definite doctrinal teaching, should be accepted by all persons taking *Orders* for the future. The suggestion was adopted. (*c.*) *Constitution of the Church.* On motion of Stahl, who reported this subject, it was resolved that the Council of Presbyters and the Consistories should be composed of clerical and lay members, and that, besides the Permanent Consistory, there should be a General Synod, in which the clerical and lay bodies should be equally represented.

The decisions of the Synod met with determined and powerful opposition, particularly from *Hengstenberg's Ecclesiastical Gazette.* It was denounced as a Robber Synod, and its members stigmatized as faithless custodians and traitors

[1] See Vol. I., p. 488.

[2] See § 423, p. 926.

Hosted by Google

to Christ, and it was found impossible to carry into effect the decrees passed by the majority.

3. In opposition to the orthodox and pietist "*Obscurantists*," who were growing daily in numbers and influence, there arose the party styled the "*Friends of Enlightenment*," who, under the direction of their leaders, *Rupp*, *Wislicenus*, and *Uhlich*, founded "free religious communities" at Koenigsberg and Magdeburg and in Thuringia. They prospered as long as they were not interfered with by government, and skillfully took advantage of the agitation caused by the "*German Catholics*." [1] They professed what they designated as a practical Christianity, based upon a rationalistic interpretation of the Bible, and in harmony with the progress of the nineteenth century. With the members of the *New School of Progressists at Tübingen*, they pronounced the labors of Christian missionaries, whether Protestant or Catholic, in both hemispheres, utterly useless, on the ground that the work would be done quite as well and better by the march of civilizing influences and the wisdom of pagan schools.

4. The mystical and pietistic sects that sprung up here and there, and of which further mention will shortly be made, were in every sense directly opposed to those of which we have just been speaking.

(*b.*) OUTSIDE OF PRUSSIA.

In other countries of Germany outside of Prussia, religious movements also took place, which reflected the peculiar characteristics of their several authors. In *Mecklenburg*, a party under the influence of the rigid Lutherans, *Kliefoth* and *Mejer*, made vigorous and persevering efforts to restore the Lutheran dogma, worship, and discipline; and in *Bavaria* a similar movement was set on foot by *Harless*, in concert with the *Lutheran* Faculty of Theology at Erlangen. Here it seems to have been in a large measure successful, for Professor *Thomasius*,[2] a man of learning and high character, gave an encouraging report of "the revival of evangelical life in the *Lutheran* Church of Bavaria." In the Bavarian Palatinate of the Rhine, however, even the ardent zeal of *Ebrard* was powerless to effect a return to the older Symbols. The members of the Reformed Church organized and protested against the decisions of the General Synods of 1853 and 1857, rejected the *new Catechism* and the *new Book of Hymns*, and demanded the maintenance of the Union, which imposed upon them no definite profession of faith. "Desirous of living in peace with his people," King Maximilian carefully abstained from using any compulsory measures.

Prelate *Ullmann* encountered an opposition not less obstinate than that against which Ebrard had struggled in vain, when, after the condemnation of *Hebel's Bible History*, he attempted to introduce in the Grand Duchy of Baden the Lutheran Catechism and that of Heidelberg and a corresponding *liturgy*.[3]

---

[1] See pp. 913 sq.

[2] *Thomasius*, Fragment of the *Eccl. Hist. of South Germany*, Erlangen, 1867. Origenes, Being a Supplement to a Hist. of Dogma, Nürnberg, 1867. Evangelical, Lutheran Dogmatics, 1857 sq.

[3] See § 427.

Hosted by Google

The reiterated efforts to force the preachers of the Duchy of Altenburg and the Grand Duchy of Hesse to adopt the *Symbolical Books*, or at least the work entitled *Positive Christianity*, as a guide for the education of youth and the instruction of the people, were all signal failures.[1]

In *Electoral Hesse*, the conflict between the Lutherans and Calvinists for the ascendency was bitter and persistent. It would seem that the recent work of *Dorner* has had the effect of allaying the animosity called forth by these discussions, and of facilitating the accomplishment of the designs of Prussia with regard to the *Union* of sects.[2]

§ 430. *Religious and Charitable Societies.*

After the learning of theologians and the diplomacy of princes had proved inadequate to accomplish the work of Union, more practical means were resorted to and frequently with success.

1. The *Evangelical Conference*, convened at Berlin in 1846, at the instance of the governments of Würtemberg and Prussia, pursued the course that had so often proved futile, confining itself to the vague statement that the Scriptures should be accepted as the rule of belief and saving doctrine, and the dogma of *justification by faith* retained. The *Ecclesiastical Conference*, which subsequently replaced it, and has since 1852 been holding its sessions at regular intervals at Pentecost, first annually, and more recently every second year, in Eisenach, at the foot of the *Wartburg*, proposed to itself a more definite work, such as collecting statistics of churches, compiling canticles worthy of preservation, and revising and harmonizing with the spirit of the age Luther's translation of the Bible.

2. In 1845 the *Evangelical Alliance*, consisting of "Evangelical Christians belonging to various churches and countries," associated together for the purpose of "concentrating the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism, and to promote the interests of Scriptural Christianity," was formed in England. Its first meeting, attended by the Evangelicals of Great Britain and Ireland, was held at Liverpool in October, 1848, whence it spread to the more important cities and towns of these countries, and branches of it have been established on the Continent of Europe and in the United States. It met with favor from Frederic William IV., at whose invitation one of its general meetings was held at Berlin in 1857. Similar meetings were held at Paris in 1855, at Geneva in 1862, and at New York in 1873. The alliance has been uniformly opposed by the High Church party in England, and by both Lutherans and Rationalists in Germany, while in the United States many were deterred from entering it, previously to the Civil War, owing to its attitude toward slavery.

---

[1] Cf. *Boltzer*, Attempts at Reconciliation, etc., Nro. II., pp. 73–75. *Bretschneider*, The Insufficiency of Compulsory Measures to have the Symbol adopted in the Evangelical Church demonstrated from the Symbolic Books Themselves, Lps. 1841.

[2] Cf. †*Hagemann*, Hist. of Protest. Theology viewed in the Light of Criticism, Bonn, 1867.

Hosted by Google

3. The Protectory, known as the "*Rauhe Haus*," founded in 1833, near Hamburg, by *Wichern*, as a refuge for abandoned or neglected children, was an eminently successful enterprise, received the approbation of the Protestant Ecclesiastical Synod, held at Wittenberg in 1848, and has ever since been doing a deal of good.

4. The *Institute of Deaconesses*, founded in 1836 at Kaiserswerth, by *Fliedner*, a Protestant preacher, on the model of the Catholic Sisters of Charity, has also prospered. There are many houses of them in Germany, and similar societies exist in England and the United States, under the name of Ladies' District-visiting Societies, Dorcas Societies, etc. Colonies of the Institute of Fliedner went even to Jerusalem, Smyrna, and Alexandria. They serve the sick, visit prisoners, have charge of reformatory houses for Magdalens and lunatic asylums, and co-operated with the "*Knights of St. John*," restored by Frederic William IV., in caring for the sick and wounded on the battle-fields of Slesvig-Holstein, Bohemia, and France.

5. A very extensive association has been formed for the relief of Protestants living in Catholic countries. Its name has a flavor of intolerance about it. It is called the *Gustavus Adolphus Association*, from the fact that it was organized by *Grossmann*, of Leipsig, in 1832, on the second centennial anniversary of the death of Sweden's great King, whose claim to be styled the Protector of Protestantism in Germany is, however, very doubtful. *Zimmermann*, of Darmstadt, succeeded to Grossmann as the leading spirit of the Association, which, in spite of its rather unpatriotic name, might be regarded as no more than a peaceful rival of the Catholic Saint Boniface Society, except for the fact that its directors seize every possible occasion to display their intolerance, which is painfully manifest in the publications known as the *Gustavus Augustus Calendars*. The Association rapidly made its way to public favor, and has in consequence immense means at its disposal. Up to the present time it has disbursed 220,000 thalers in Rhenish Prussia, 157,000 in Hungary, 142,000 in Bohemia, 120,000 in Austria Proper, and 124,000 in Moravia, Carinthia, and Styria, all of which is applied to building churches and promoting the general interests of Protestantism.

6. Finally, a number of preachers, devoted to the older and more orthodox forms of Lutheranism, met in the Chapel of the Castle of Wittenberg in 1848, and founded an Association for the purpose of fostering the principles of faith and making a stand against the prevalent decadence of the times. Its aims and its progress were brought before the public by means of meetings held every second year, at which *Bethmann-Holweg* and *Stahl* usually presided. The Association met successively at Wittenberg, Stuttgart, Elberfeld, Bremen, Berlin, Frankfort, Lübeck, Hamburg, Barmen, Brandenburg, Altenburg, and Neustadt on the Hardt (1867). At the outset its members professed a positive form of belief, but as time went on, the effects of the corroding spirit of dissolution inherent in Protestantism began to appear, and the only link that continued to hold them together was their common hatred of the Catholic Church. Finally, during the presidency of *Bluntschli*, and on the motion of Professor *Holtzmann*, of Heidelberg, "the teachings of Schenkel were declared to be authorized by the Protestant Church," the decrees of the General Assembly of

Hosted by Google

Carlsruhe (1867) approved, and the protests of the clergy of Baden disregarded and repudiated.

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM OUTSIDE OF GERMANY.

For bibliography, see *Niedner's* Manual of Church History, ed. of 1866, p. 921–929, and Dr. *Chas. Hase's* Hist. of the Christian Church, 9th ed., p. 622–645; Engl. tr., New York, 1873, p. 597 sq.

§ 431. *Protestantism in Denmark, Sweden, Holland, France, Great Britain, and America.*

The influence of German theology was first felt in *Denmark*, where it was propagated by *Clausen*, a disciple of Schleiermacher's, who, though a deputy and minister of State, was an ardent student of divinity, and by *Münter* and the two bishops, *Martensen* and *Mynster*. When, in 1826, Clausen was brought to trial and condemned on the complaint of *Grundtvig*, as a fomentor of idolatry, he threw up his parochial charge; but this only increased his activity to promote the progress of illegal religious conventicles. With the assistance of *Kierkegaard*, he finally succeeded in establishing a *national* church, fiercely opposed to religious innovations of every kind from Germany, and the center of a determined hostility against the *Lutheran* clergy, the representatives of the Established Church of Denmark. Through his persevering efforts, between the years 1855 and 1857, liberty of conscience was granted to the Danish people, who were no longer legally obliged to attend the services of the State church or to have their children baptized by its ministers. The Catholic Church also reaped the benefits of this agitation and its results.

In *Sweden* the position of the Church is quite different. Here the influence of German theology has been hardly felt outside the lecture-room. The infamous laws of 1686 operate equally against *Dissenters* and *Catholics*, and conversion to Catholicism is punished with banishment. Since 1803 the enactment of 1726 against religious conventicles has been rigidly enforced in the case of the Pietists, who, because of their assiduous reading of the Bible and the works of Luther, have received the name of *Läsare*. Fines and imprisonments are the punishments usually inflicted upon them; but in *Finmark*, where the people are poor and enthusiastically religious, the law has entailed extreme hardship, as those of the inhabitants who choose to remain loyal to their convictions have been forced to part with their reindeer to satisfy its exactions. In many instances, however, the laws have been leniently enforced or their infringement prudently overlooked. "Bishop" *Esaias Tegner*, by his writings, and notably by his *Frithiof's Saga*, has acquired some fame as a poet.

Between *German Switzerland* and Germany the relations have been more intimate. German theologians held professors' chairs at the Universities of *Basle*, *Berne*, and *Zürich*, and Swiss theologians in turn at many of the Universities of Germany. Of the former, it will be sufficient to instance *De Wette*

Hosted by Google

at Basle, Otho Fridolin *Fritzsche* and *Keim* at Zürich, and *Gelpke* at Berne; and of the latter, *Gelzer* at Berlin, *Herzog* at Erlangen, and *Schenkel* at Heidelberg. There were also many Swiss theologians, who became prominent at home in the religious movement, among whom were ***Hagenbach***, of Basle, and *Alexander Schweitzer*, *Böhringer*, *Henry Lang*, and *Hirzel*, of Zürich. In Switzerland, a republican constitution, the right of congregations to select their own pastors, and the absence of any obligation to believe in symbols, all contributed to foster extreme views in religion. That the same spirit that pervaded practical life was also dominant in the schools is evident from the fact that *David Strauss* was called to Zürich in 1839 and *Zeller* to Berne in 1847, to teach theology. From the wealthy city of Basle, the seat of numerous *missionary* and *Bible Societies*, multitudinous tracts have been issued and scattered all over Germany, with a view to propagating *modern pietism*. But, as we shall see in a subsequent paragraph, this city was also the home of *tendencies the most divergent* and of parties the most antagonistic.

Between the people of German Switzerland and *Holland*, or that portion of the Alpine country inhabited by a German population, and the lowland regions lying along the Rhine from its source to its mouth, there exists now as formerly a close resemblance and affinity. In both these countries, in which the *Reformed* is the dominant religion, one meets with the most devoted attachment to rigorous formularies and symbols of faith, existing side by side, with a readiness to adopt the most extreme theological views. This latter tendency has been fostered in Holland by the *Voices of the Times*, a periodical, since 1859 published in Switzerland. The poets, *Bilderdyk* and *Isaac da Costa*, appealed urgently to their countrymen to return to the more primitive orthodox teachings of their Church; while the young clergyman, *Henry de Cock*, warmly defended the decrees of the famous Synod of Dordrecht,[1] threatening that, if they were not adhered to, he and the numerous body who shared his opinions would separate from the national church. In consequence the *Separatists* were arrested, fined, and imprisoned, as disturbers of the peace, until 1839, when they were permitted by royal order to establish *Christian Separatist Congregations*. When, in 1848, the principle of religious freedom was granted as a part of the radical reforms in government introduced in that year, the *Independent Synodal System* was organized. By this arrangement all ecclesiastical affairs are submitted to the action of a *General Synod*, which meets annually at The Hague, and to which ten provincial synods and the three Theological Faculties of Leyden, Utrecht, and Gröningen send delegates. The General Synod also appoints a Commission, by which all business is transacted in the interval between the sessions of that body. Since then there has been a very decided tendency visible among the Dutch theologians toward more independent views in ecclesiastical affairs and a greater attachment to *evangelical* theology.

Mention should also be made, in connection with the Separatist movement led by de Cock, of the *Lutheran Re-established Church*, founded at Amsterdam in 1791; of the religious community called "*Chrisio sacrum*," founded at Delft

[1] See § 340, pp. 327 sq.

Hosted by Google

between the years 1797 and 1801; and of the *Niemoe Lichtess*, a sort of Quakers, founded in 1845.[1]

There are also many points of resemblance between *French Switzerland* and that portion of *France inhabited by Calvinists*, the explanation of which is to be sought in the common origin of the religion of both districts and in the similarity of the language and manners of the people. In *Geneva*, the citadel of Calvinism, the influence of J. J. Rousseau caused a noticable deterioration of the high standard of Christian morality previously maintained. Simultaneously with the celebration of the centennial jubilee in honor of the Reformation, a number of zealous preachers, associated under the common name of the "*Vénerable Compagnie*," avowed themselves the ardent advocates and defenders of the fundamental doctrines of *Orthodox Calvinism*. At this time also *Madame de Krüdener*, a woman of unusual spirit and considerable influence with several princes, became the head of a sect composed of Swiss Calvinists and English Methodists, who advocated a revival of "*Evangelical*" Christianity, and were contemptuously called *Momiers*. They were hated and in some instances violently assaulted by the people, whose innocent amusements they denounced, and persecuted by the government, by which they were regarded as Separatists. After the Revolution of 1830, however, when religious freedom was proclaimed, the persecution ceased, but a reaction set in against them, which took definite shape in *The Evangelical Society of Geneva*. Under the auspices of this Society a college was founded and placed under the direction of the learned and zealous *Merle d'Aubigné*, for the education of rigidly orthodox ministers. In 1835 the jubilee, commemorative of the introduction of the Reformation into Geneva, was celebrated with great pomp and circumstance. By the Revolution of 1846 the Evangelical Society was overthrown, and the administration of the affairs of the National Church vested in a *Consistory*, whose members were elected by the Congregations. It had also been rigorously inculcated by the orthodox theologians of Berne that the Church was absolutely dependent upon the State; but *Vinet*, at Lausanne († 1847), and the adherents of the "*Free Church of the Canton of Vaud*" began an agitation in favor of the contrary doctrine, which gradually gained ground among the clergy, who, as time went on, lost their official character.[2] Liberal religious views spread so rapidly and became so generally diffused among the Calvinists of Switzerland that at the ter-centennial anniversary of the death of their founder, in 1864, they repudiated his claim to the title of a national hero, and emphatically protested against his religious system as cruelly despotic.[3]

By the two revolutions of 1830 and 1848, but chiefly by the prevalence of modern ideas, the condition of Protestants in *France* has been greatly ameliorated, and, as a consequence, their number has largely increased, and they now carry on an active propagandism publicly and without restraint. They were at one time so hopeful that their intention of converting the entire country was boastfully announced from Geneva. *Il faut évangéliser la France*, they

[1] They took as the underlying principle of their creed the words of Acts, iv. 12.

[2] Conf. *Herzog's* Encyclopaedia, Vol. XVII., art. "*Vinet*," p. 766–820.

[3] See § 321, p. 149.

Hosted by Google

said, but their progress was arrested by dissensions within their own body. Among the most active and potent organizations of these sectaries was the *Société évangélique*, founded at Paris in 1832, which, mainly through the influence of the newspaper *Le Semeur* and that exerted by *Vinet* at Lausanne, was at one time quite numerous. Its agents made themselves so offensive by ostentatiously hawking Bibles and tracts containing libelous slanders on Catholics and members of the Reformed Church, that the police were obliged to interfere in the interests of public peace, and for a short interval the Société was under the ban of the law. Another of these organizations is the *Union des églises évangéliques de France*, founded in 1848 by Count *Gasparin* and *Frederic Monod*. These sectaries, who profess a sort of symbol, composed of selections from the devotional portions of the writings of St. John and St. Paul, are most malignant in their hostility to the Catholic Church, because her priests receive a salary from the government. Other organizations were formed of a kindred character, and professing either Methodist or Baptist doctrines, but by no means of equal importance.

Diametrically opposed to all these was the ultra-rationalistic party, represented by men like *Pécaut*, *Réville*, and the younger *Coquerel*, and some time later by *Edmond Scherer* and *Colani*, who, being disciples of the Tübingen school of Baur, denied the divine origin of Christianity and controverted the authenticity of its miracles. The outcome and fullest expression of the tenets of this school was *The Life of Jesus* and other works on the origin of Christianity by *Renan*. It was successfully opposed by M. *de Pressensé*,[1] in his numerous writings, and by M. *Guizot* († 1877), at one time Minister of State, in his *Méditations* and *Église et société crétienne*. At the last Synod, held in Paris in June, 1872, Colani and Coquerel were vehemently attacked by M. de Pressensé, who triumphantly vindicated on that occasion the supernatural character of Christianity. When the *Orthodox Profession of Faith*, was submitted to the Synod, it was found that there was a numerous minority of Materialists, or, as they prefer to call themselves, Liberals, against it; and it only passed by a majority of sixteen, the vote standing sixty-one affirmative and forty-five negative. but in charitable associations, in which French Protestants have attempted to rival Catholics, the results have been more encouraging, and much good has been done through their agency.

Among the *Theological Faculties* the most eminent are, first, the Orthodox Calvinistic Faculty of *Montauban*, and next the Lutheran Faculty of *Strasburg*, which, being in close contact with the science and literature of Germany, have produced works of exceptional excellence. The writings of their more distinguished representatives, such as *Matter*, *Schmidt*, *Baum*, and, above all, *Reuss*, have received high praise from German scholars.[2]

[1] *Edmond de Pressensé*, Histoire des trois premiers siècles de l'église, 4 vols., Paris, 1858–1861; Jésus-Christ, son temps, sa vie et ses oeuvres, 3d ed., 1866; Le Concile du Vatican, 1872; La liberté religieuse en Europe en 1870, Paris, 1874; La vie morale des premiers chrétiens, 1875. The first two works have been translated into German and other languages. He is the chief editor of the Revue chrétienne, which he founded. The bulletin théologique forms a supplement to it.

[2] *Reuss*, Hist. of the N. T. Scriptures, 4th ed., Brunswick, 1864; Theological

Hosted by Google

Since the opening of the century the *Established Church of England* and *Kirk of Scotland* have displayed remarkable energy, and have been unusually active. The bishops of the Established Church, possessing comfortable livings and enormous revenues, and strengthened by their alliance with the aristocracy, for a long time obstinately refused to yield to the demands of the Dissenters, or, in obedience to the wishes of government, to make the changes which, it was urged, the circumstances of the age rendered necessary and peremptory. As a consequence, the two branches of the Establishment, the *High Church* and the *Low Church*, or the Evangelicals, grew daily more hostile to each other; and while the Evangelicals denounced the *Catholic* tendencies of the High-Churchmen, the High-Churchmen denounced with equal vehemence the *Protestant* tendencies of the Evangelicals. In 1833 a rally was begun in favor of High-Church principles, which issued in what are known as the *Tractarian* or *Puseyite* and *Ritualistic* movements, the former headed by Dr. *Newman*, Dr. *Pusey*, *John Keble*, and other Oxford men, and both having the effect of leading many into the Catholic Church.[1] These events still further incensed the *Evangelicals*, who, availing themselves of the excited state of religious feeling produced by the late Methodist agitation, renewed their demands and extorted some concessions from the Anglican bishops. The position of both rectors and curates was much improved, and the spiritual wants of the people better served. Extraordinary efforts were made by both parties for the *propagation of Christianity* and the diffusion of the *Bible;* numerous churches were erected and distress of every kind relieved. Attention was also given to Christian morals, which were everywhere decaying, and to the *observance of Sunday*, which was almost universally neglected by certain classes. Between the High-Church Party, in which personality was lost sight of and loyalty to the Church prominently put forward, and the Low-Church Party, in which the claims of the Church were made secondary to the claims of the individual, there arose a *third*, styled the *Broad Church Party*, whose partisans advocated more liberal or broader views of religion and Christian life.[2]

In opposition at once to the apathy of the Established Church, to the Catholic tendencies of the Puseyite Movement, and to the indifference to any religion whatever prevalent among the bulk of the people, an association called the *Evangelical Alliance* was formed in 1845, which, ignoring altogether the idea of a definite Church, professes to be based on the broad principles of Christianity, a creed which has at least the merit of elasticity, and may embrace anything or nothing.[3]

Science among the French Protestants (Theological Studies and Criticisms, 1844, No. 1).

[1] See § 417, pp. 848 sq.

[2] Cf. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 904–910. Dr. *Arnold*, Master of Rugby from 1828 to 1842, the year of his death, is generally credited with being the founder of this Party, and Heve, Whately, and Maurice were among its ablest representatives. (Tr.)

[3] Dr. *Brownson*, speaking of the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance held in New York, in October, 1873, says: "The Protestantism represented by it is, as a power in society, a thing of the past, and has no significance for the pres-

Hosted by Google

Puseyism has rendered an important service to *theological science* by reviving patristic studies and stimulating that spirit of deep research which is so prominent in the English character, and which has led to the discovery of the important ecclesiastical documents published by the famous Orientalist, *Cureton* (b. 1808, d. 1864).[1] It also created a taste for *exegetics*, and in particular for Christian *apologetics* or evidences. While most of the writers at this time remained within the traditional bounds of Anglican theology, there were some who went a long way beyond them, and the *Essays and Reviews*, which were the maturest and fullest expression of such men, produced a profound sensation when they appeared in 1860. To the great scandal of the Church of England, it was soon learned that among the authors of this work some were Anglican dignitaries.[2] In the first *Essay*, on "*The Education of the World*," the divine interposition in human affairs is denied, and it is maintained that the present religious condition of mankind is the result of natural development;[3] in the *second*, the authenticity of the Bible and the verity of its prophecies are denied; in the *third*, it is attempted to prove that it is unreasonable to believe God ever wrought miracles or created the world, and, as a consequence, that creation and miracles afford no evidence of the existence of a Divine Being; in the *fourth*, it is maintained that the Scriptural characteristics of Jesus belong, not to an historical, but to an ideal personage; that the annunciation is likewise ideal, etc.; in the *fifth*, the Book of Genesis is said to have been written by some Hebrew scientist, who, not being guided by modern geological researches, blundered egregiously; in the *sixth*, on "The Tendencies of Religious Thought

---

ent. It is neither frankly infidel nor frankly Christian, but strives to be a little of both. It has no principle of its own, but borrows infidel principles when it would fight against the Church, and Church principles when it would fight infidelity. The Alliance claims to be Christian, and its aim seems to be to wage a relentless war against Catholicity on the right and rationalism on the left; but, unhappily for it, it has no base for its operations against either, and is unable to conduct its war on any scientific principles, taken either from reason or revelation. When it attacks rationalism, it exposes itself to the merciless attacks of Catholics in flank; and when it turns against Catholics it exposes itself to the equally merciless attacks of the rationalists in the rear." *Quart. Review*, January, 1874. (Tr.)

[1] Corpus Ignatianum, London, 1849; Spicilegium Syriacum, London, 1855; Athanasii epist. festales, London, 1848; Hist. eccl. Johannis episcopi Ephes., Oxford, 1853.

[2] The *Essays and Reviews* were seven in number, the productions of as many writers, and published in February, 1860, under the editorial supervision of Prof. *Jowett*. The first Essay was by Dr. *Temple*, then Master of Rugby School; the second by Dr. *Rowland Williams*, Vice-Principal of Lampeter, a Welsh College; the third by Mr. *Baden Powell*, Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford; the fourth by the Rev. *H. B. Wilson*, Vicar of Great Stoughton; the fifth by Mr. *C. Goodwin*, a layman; the sixth by the Rev. *Mark Pattison*, then fellow and afterward Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford; and the last by the Editor, Mr. *Jowett*, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford. (Tr.)

[3] This is only a plagiarism of *Lessing's* Essay on the same subject. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

in England from 1688 to 1750," there is little remarkable, except what it derives from its questionable company; in the *seventh*, on the "Interpretation of Scripture" inspiration is denied, and an effort made to adapt Scriptures to the theories set forth in the preceding Essays. The doctrines contained in this work were condemned as "pernicious," and their tendencies as "heretical," by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in July, 1864. Two of its authors were condemned by the Court of Arches and suspended for a year from their benefices in 1862; but the judgment was reversed by the Crown in Council on the 8th of February, 1864, when it was judicially stated that "on the design and general tendency" of the *Essays and Reviews*, the Committee "neither *can* nor *do* pronounce any opinion." [1] Dr. *Colenso*, Bishop of Natal, in Southeastern Africa, who, having adopted the principles of modern rationalistic criticism, published in 1862 his work, entitled "The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined," denying these to be records of even "historical truth," was requested by all the Anglican bishops of England and Ireland, except three, to resign his see, which refusing to do, he was tried by a provincial synod at Cape Town, and formally deposed by his Metropolitan, November 27, 1863; but the decision was subsequently reversed by the Crown in Council, on the ground that "the Bishop of Cape Town has no jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal." [2]

Ever since the union of *Scotland* with England, in 1707, the *Constitution of the True Kirk* has been a prominent subject of discussion, one of the more vital questions being whether the right of nominating ministers to parishes resides in the congregations or in the landed proprietors, who claim the right of patronage in the Reformed Church of that country.

Although the rights and privileges of the Church of Scotland had been explicitly recognized at various times by the English government, and expressly guaranteed by William and Mary in 1688, and again by the Act of Union in 1707, still in 1712 an act was passed by the British Parliament restoring the right of patronage in Scotland. This act gave rise to many and violent dissensions in the Kirk, and was the occasion of numerous separations from it, which have been perpetuated down to the present day. But notwithstanding that the right of patronage was enforced for above a century, there was as yet no direct invasion of ecclesiastical authority by the civil courts or the civil power, the right of presentation being regarded as only a civil prerogative, entitling the appointee, who received ecclesiastical recognition from the authorities of the Kirk, to the benefice and its emoluments. Moreover, in the exercise of the

---

[1] See *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, etc., art. "Broad Church;" also Cardinal *Manning*, England and Christendom, London, 1867, pp. 3–79. We have spoken in detail of the *Essays and Reviews*, not because they possess any intrinsic value, but because they are historical and mark an epoch, being the most notorious, if not the best, production of a very indifferent school. *Andreas Wagner*, Professor of Natural Sciences at the University of Munich, to whom they were handed by the Editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (Vorwort, 1862) to determine their scientific value, returned them with the remark that "*the book was beneath all criticism.*" (Tr.)

[2] *Blunt*, Ibid. (Tr.) Cf. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology, pp. 910–915.

Hosted by Google

right of patronage, care was taken to observe the ancient custom of having the "*call*" *made by the parishioners*, though it was at best only an empty form.

In these latter days, when the Church of Scotland, like those of other countries, has sprung into vigorous life, the old Puritanic leaven has permeated the masses and once more aroused the old spirit of independence. The question of patronage began to be again agitated, and an *Anti-Patronage Society* was founded in 1825 by Dr. *Andrew Thompson*, a leading minister of Edinburgh. But the contest was not formally inaugurated until 1833, when Dr. *Thomas Chalmers*, a minister of Glasgow, proposed to the General Assembly of that year a Veto Act, providing that any presentation should be set aside if opposed by one-half of the male heads of families, with or without specific reason, if they were communicants. The proposition was rejected, but one of equivalent import presented and carried in the following year against the *Moderates*, who were gradually losing ground. The case of Mr. *Robert Young*, who was rejected by a large majority of qualified heads of families, was made a test case, and, after having been carried from one court to another, was finally decided in the English House of Lords against the *Non-Intrusionists*, and the Veto declared illegal. Finally, the General Assembly agreed to the presentation of a bill in Parliament providing that, unless it were proved that the opposition to the presentee proceeded from factious and unreasonable prejudice, the instructions of the Veto should be carried out; but this was thrown out on technical grounds in 1842. The Non-Intrusionists sent a Petition of Right, embodying their claims, to Parliament in 1843, and when they learned that it had been rejected in the House of Commons, they met in General Assembly on the 18th of May of the same year, and after protesting against the action of Parliament, headed by Dr. *Welsh*, the Moderator, and Dr. Chalmers, 451 of them formally seceded from the Establishment, and organized the General Assembly of the Free Kirk of Scotland. The old spirit of the Covenanters once more swept over the country, and it was not long until every parish had its Free Kirk and Manse, and a "Sustentation Fund" was rapidly raised, which in 1874 yielded £150 to each of 775 ministers, not including the special collections of the congregations. There were, in 1874, 920 congregations and 597 schools in Scotland belonging to the Free Kirk, and a number of affiliated congregations in England, Ireland, and the United States, and in Canada and other colonies of England. Colleges for educating ministers were also founded at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. Much of the asperity which at first existed between the Free Kirk and the Established Church of Scotland has already disappeared.[1] The great *schism* in the Church of Scotland gave occasion to others of lesser importance, the chief of which was that of the *Irvingites*, who believe in a renewal of the prophetic and apostolic offices, and call themselves the "Catholic and Apostolic Church."

The peculiar characteristics of Protestantism in the *United States* of North America are mainly due to the varied nationalities from which its population has been recruited and to the principle of complete *separation of Church and State*, which is rigorously carried out, the various religious congregations being regarded by the government as merely civil corporations. Notwithstanding

[1] *Blunt*, Dict. of Sects, etc., art. "Free Kirk of Scotland." (TR.)

Hosted by Google

that no formal recognition of any Church exists, Christianity is tacitly recognized as part of the Common Law; the observance of the Lord's Day is stringently enforced; and public prayers are daily offered up in legislative bodies while in session.[1] There is no discrimination between truth and error, and all opinions and creeds may be freely held and propagated, whether in private or public, provided only the rights of others are not invaded or morality openly outraged. There exists there, side by side, every form of religious belief, ancient and modern, and new sects are daily multiplying. There are to be found pietists and illuminati, and the superstitious votaries of the fooleries of turning-tables, spirit-rappings, spirit-mediums, and planchettes, in which, strange to say, these people, so boastful of their superior enlightenment, place implicit reliance. Still Christianity is making extraordinary progress, and promises to be eventually completely triumphant.

These multitudinous sects, owing to their feverish, unstable, and evanescent existence, have not gained any notable distinction in the fields of literature and science, or produced any works of eminent merit. There hardly exists a necessity to impel their members to devote themselves to the learned pursuits, inasmuch as they are supplied from England and Scotland, but notably from Germany, with works sufficiently varied to suit the needs of minds the most divergent. *Schaff*, a disciple of Neander's, and at first a professor at Mercersburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, and afterward in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and *Nevin*, an equally eminent scholar, have been quite successful in their efforts to diffuse Protestant theology among both the English-speaking and German Protestants of the United States.[2] The political institutions and commercial conditions of the country have had a marked influence upon the religious character of the people, particularly outside the Catholic Church. The absence of the principle of conservatism in politics has contributed, probably more than is generally supposed, to the multiplication of sects with slight denominational differences, and the commercial energy of the people has given a feverish, though spasmodic activity to religious enterprises. One would be led antecedently to expect that the American system of secular education would make those who have been brought up under its influences indifferent to the distinctively doctrinal teachings of the various sects, and such is in matter of fact the case. The number of Americans who pay any attention to doctrinal differences is, as compared with the entire population, remarkably small; and it is not too much to say that positive faith, as a substantive and definite reality, is rapidly fading from the minds of the great bulk of the non-Catholic citizens. Those of them who profess to be religious at all, do so on moral rather than dogmatic grounds, or, in other words, act from merely human rather than divine motives. They do not believe in the subjection of

[1] Constitutions of several States and of the U. S., etc., New York, 8vo. *J. Story*, Exposition of the Const. of the U. S., N. York, 1847. *M. McKinney*, Amer. Magistrate, Philad. 1850, pp. 689, 193, 203. *G. T. Curtis*, Hist. of the Const. of the U. S., New York, 1854, 2 vols.

[2] Cfr. *Dorner*, in l. c., p. 915–918, and *Schaff*, "America," or the Political, Social, and Ecclesiastico-Religious Condition of the United States, especially in reference to the Germans, Berlin, 1864.

Hosted by Google

the intellect to any constituted magisterial authority in matters of faith, and, as a consequence, they have no sanction for their conduct higher than a vague conception of the existence of God. the divinity of Christ, and the necessity of a moral law. Their charities, too, which are probably as numerous and abundant as in any country of the world except France, are inspired, not by a religious conviction of the necessity of giving alms and ministering to the poor and the outcast, but by the generous promptings and benevolent feelings which are so prominent in the American character. We do not say that belief in the divinity of Christ does not exist, and is not put forward by religious organizations outside the Catholic Church, but we do say that the Incarnation, together with the distinctive doctrines flowing from it and connected with it, or, in other words, the scheme of man's redemption as a whole and in detail, is not understood by the bulk of the American people, and has no firm hold on their minds. In fact, the non-Catholics below a certain degree in the social scale rarely enter a church at all, and when they do they are impelled by other than supernatural motives. Of the churches that still continue to teach a definite creed, in as far as merely human authority can be said to be an exponent of divine truth, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Baptist have been the most successful; and it must be said that they have contributed not a little to revive religious feeling of the hazy, indefinite kind we have described. Religious revivals are frequent, and their efforts are temporarily violent, but, like all abnormal agencies, produce no permanent result for good. There are also numerous Protestant seminaries, religious periodicals and newspapers, and vast societies for removing social evils and evangelizing the poor, both at home and abroad, but all these enterprises labor under the same radical defect. They have no supernatural sanction, because they are not the outgrowth of a body of positive teaching, which, coming from God, must be as absolutely one and unchangeable as is the God of truth Himself.

§ 432. *Enumeration of Sects, Ancient and Modern.*

I. The *Baptists* or *Rebaptizers*, so numerous in England and the United States, were introduced into Germany in 1834, through the preaching of the American missionary, *Oncken*.[1] After remaining for a time in Hamburg, he visited nearly every portion of Germany and Denmark, and made a small number of converts to his teaching in Prussia, Würtemberg, and the smaller German States, and in Switzerland. This pietistical sect rejected the authority of Protestant synods and the Evangelical Alliance quite as courageously as the sectaries of the same name had that of Luther and Melanchthon.

II. Like the Anabaptists, the sect of *Rationalistic Unitarians*, who deny the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, has been revived in these latter days, and has numerous adherents, both in England and the United States.

[1] *John Gerard Oncken* was born at Varel, Oldenburg, about 1800. He was first a servant and subsequently a book agent for the Edinburgh Bible Society, and afterward became a missionary. Cf. *Jörg*, Hist. of Potestantism, Vol. II., pp. 16 sq.

Hosted by Google

The chief apostle in the latter country of this repulsive rationalism was Mr. *Channing*, of Boston, whose disciples are also known as Universalists.

III. The *Moravian Brethren* and the *Methodists*, though widely separated as regards doctrine, have both labored with disinterested zeal to revive and stimulate religious life in Europe and America.

IV. Extreme *pietism* appeared under a novel and remarkable form in Würtemberg. In 1818, *Hoffmann*, burgomaster and notary of Leonberg, obtained a license from the government to form a religious society at *Kornthal* on the model of the communities of the apostolic age. Its members, fully persuaded that *the convulsions and confusion which shall precede the final coming of Christ* were already taking place, set themselves to appease as best they could the anger of God. By *Bengel*, a learned exegetical writer of Würtemberg, the year 1836 was assigned as the date of the end of the world. *Christopher Hoffmann*, inspector of the Evangelical school near Ludwigsburg, who had been successful over David Strauss [1] for a seat in the Frankfort Parliament, following in the footsteps of his father, and despairing of the political and ecclesiastical condition of Europe, founded in the Hardthof, near Marburg, in 1856, a provisional home for the elect of God, where they were to await their translation to *Palestine*, there to resume the life of true Christians, after the model foreshadowed by the Prophets.

At *Wildenspuch*, in the Canton of Zürich, the pietistic infatuation was carried to an incredible excess. *Margaret Peter*, an unmarried woman and the daughter of a farmer, by association with men calling themselves the "*Revived*," and by the reading of works on mysticism, wrought herself up to such a pitch of excitement that she believed, or professed to believe, that events of extraordinary religious import were shortly to take place. This conviction stimulated her activity for the salvation of herself and those about her. Although a notorious adulteress, she exerted a powerful influence in the religious assemblies of the "Revived." Stricken with remorse of conscience and the victim of wounded spiritual pride, she lacerated her body most cruelly, stating that she did so "by command of God." For the purpose, as she pretended, of gaining allies to confound the devil and of making an acceptable offering to Christ, she, on the 15th of March, 1823, had her brother and others scourged unto the shedding of blood, after which she killed her sister Elizabeth with a club, and finally had herself put to death by crucifixion. She had predicted that she would rise again on the third day, but failed to make good her promise.[2]

Similar exhibitions of devotion, mortification, and lust took place in the pietistical conventicles of *East Prussia* and the *Wupperthal*. A Mr. *Stephan*, pastor of a congregation of Bohemians in Dresden, after having induced a large number of persons to embrace a species of Lutheran Pietism, and been active in encouraging others to emigrate to America, was arrested, brought before the courts, and convicted of having seduced many married and single women.

Akin to this utter prostitution of religion to base purposes is the profession of the *Mormons*, or, as they prefer to call themselves, The Free Church of Jesus

[1] *Jörg*, l. c., Vol. II., pp. 203–280.

[2] *L. Meyer*, The Frightful Scenes at Wildenspuch, 2d ed., Zürich, 1824. *Jarcke*, The Frightful Scenes at Wildenspuch (Miscellanea), Munich, 1839.

Hosted by Google

Christ of *Latter-Day Saints*, founded in 1827 in North America by *Joseph Smith*.[1] Born in the year 1805, in the State of Vermont, of disreputable parents, Smith, from his earliest years, was a visionary, and as he grew in age continued meditative and solitary, and finally professed to have been honored with angelic visits. On the 22d of September, 1827, after passing through a certain disciplinary preparation, he received from the hands of his angelic visitants wonderful records, engraven on metallic plates, and containing the history of the earliest inhabitants of America. The first of these were the *Jaredites*, a wicked and bloodthirsty race from Babel, who destroyed each other in incessant wars; and the next the American Indians or the descendants of *Lehi*, a Jewish patriarch, who set out from Jerusalem during the reign of Zedekias, and, after many wanderings, made his way to America. These aboriginal tribes had been converted by Our Lord in person, but subsequently losing their faith, a prophet named *Mormon* wrote out their history, traditions, religious usages, etc., and buried the record in the earth. This wonderful record, believed by the Mormons to be of equal authority with the Bible, was brought to light in 1830, but, as has been since proven, is nearly a literal transcript of a romance left in manuscript by *Solomon Spalding*, a clergyman, who died in 1816. Professing to be a prophet, Smith soon gathered about him a large number of disciples, and organized his first church at Manchester, N. Y., in 1830; but in the following year went west as far as Kirtland, O., where his followers still continued to increase. A colony went to Missouri, and established what they called the "Zion" at the town of Independence. In 1838, the Saints, to the number of 15,000, quitted Missouri, and passing over to Illinois, built there *Nauvoo*, or the City of Beauty, of which Smith, who was shot by a mob in 1844, became the supreme ruler. It was here that "celestial marriage," or polygamy, was first practiced.

In 1845 the hostility of the "*Gentiles*" grew so intense and threatening that the Mormons were forced to quit Nauvoo, and passing beyond the limits of civilization, they settled on the shores of Salt Lake, in the present territory of Utah, in 1846. From this new Zion missionaries have gone forth into all quarters of the world to make converts to the Church of the Latter-Day Saints. They call their government a *Theo-Democracy*, its organization consisting of a presidency, a patriarchate, a council of twelve, a college of seventy or the propagandists, a body of high-priests, of bishops, of elders, of priests or ministers, and of teachers and deacons or catechists, and church-collectors.

The doctrine of the Mormons, prescinding altogether from its gross and degrading materialism, is the most grotesque mass of absurd rubbish that the human mind can well conceive.

Their distinctively social institution of polygamy receives its sanction from a pretended revelation to the prophet in 1843, according to which the rank and dignity of the Saints in the world to come would be proportioned to the num-

[1] Book of Mormon, Book of Covenants. The former work has been several times printed since 1830, even in German; tr. by *Pratt*, Eine Stimme der Warnung und Belehrung für alle Völker, from the English, Hamburg, 1853. *Turner*, Mormonism in all Ages, New York, 1843. **Jörg*, Hist. of Protest., Vol. II., p. 444–603. *Herzog's* Cyclop., Vol. X., p. 1–17.

Hosted by Google

ber of their wives and children in this. There is also among them a partial community of goods, and they have very justly been compared in many respects to the Mohammedans. The origin of the two systems rests upon a fictitious revelation, and the motives, rewards, and punishments are strikingly similar in both. The sect has been permitted to exist, because it has been until quite recently beyond the bounds of civilization, but its legal or forcible suppression is only a question of years.

V. *Edward Irving* († 1834), a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who, however, passed most of his public life in London, was the reputed founder of a very peculiar form of sectarianism. After a short and unsuccessful ministry in Scotland, he came to London in 1822, and was soon recognized as the most eloquent preacher that had appeared in the metropolis for years. A close student of the Prophets, of Shakespeare and Byron, his language was naturally elevated, fervid, and energetic, and his church was thronged with the *élite* of London society. But, as time went on, his style palled upon the ears of his hearers, who deserted him in large numbers, and seeing his popularity waning, he implored the Holy Ghost with passionate earnestness to bestow upon him the gifts of the Apostles, that he might proclaim to the world in fitting terms the second personal coming of Christ, which he believed to be near at hand. In the conviction that his prayer had been heard, he began, like the Christians at Corinth, to preach discourses utterly incomprehensible to his hearers, and to fancy that he had ecstatic visions (γλώσσαις λαλεῖν). He was tried before the London presbytery on the charge of heresy in 1830, convicted, and deprived of his charge in 1832, and in the following year deposed. The majority of his congregation, captivated by the brilliancy and eloquence of his defense, remained loyal to him, and with these originated the sect of *Irvingites*, or, as they call themselves, the *Apostolic Catholic Church*. They believe that the gift of prophecy and the apostolic gift of tongues are inherent and perpetual in the Church, which embraces the fourfold ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors or angels. The Irvingites have established themselves in England, Canada, the United States, Prussia, France, and Switzerland, especially at Geneva, but they are by no means numerous. In Germany, among the converts to this new Church of the Future, were the pietist theologian, *Thiersch*, of Marburg, and the two Catholic priests, *Lutz*, of Oberroth in Bavaria, and *Spindler*, of Augsburg.[1]

§ 433. *Protestant Missions and Bible Societies.*

Blumhardt, Magazine of the Most Recent Hist. of Evang. Missions and Bible Societies, Basle, 1816. The Annual Reports of London, Edinburgh, Basle, Halle, and Berlin, on the Success of the Bible Societies and the Progress of Evangelical Missionary Work during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Berlin, 1828. *Steger*, Protestant Missions, Hof (1838), 1844; *new series*

---

[1] *Jörg*, Hist. of Protest., Vol. II., p. 77–203. *Lutz*, Farewell Address to My Parish of Oberroth, Kaufbeuren, 1857. God's Work in these Latter Days, Ulm, 1857. *Jacobi*, The Doctrine of the Irvingites, 2d ed., Berlin, 1868.

Hosted by Google

for 1830–1841, Ibid., 1842. *Wiggers*, Hist of Evang, Missions, Hamburg, 1845, 2 vols. Missionary Reports of the East India Missionary Institute at Halle since 1849, Halle, 1849 sq. *Kalkar*, Dew evangeliske Missions-Historie, Copenhagen, 1857. A fine and carefully elaborated geographical map, giving the Protestant Missionary Stations, by *Theophilus König*, Berlin, 1851. *American Cyclopaedia*, art. "Missions, Foreign." *Grundemann*, General *Missionary Atlas*, Gotha, 1867–1871 (72 colored maps), merits special attention. † *Wiseman*, Sterility of Missions undertaken by Protestants; Germ. transl., Augsburg, 1835; a similar judgment is passed by a *Protestant* missionary in a foreign country, 1840, Nros. 119, 120, and by *Marshall* in Christian Missions.

We have already stated that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was comparatively little activity in Protestant missions.

The first great Protestant missionary society, called the "*Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*," was formed in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Having been originally designed for the establishment and maintenance of colonial churches, its operations have been confined to the British colonies in the East and West Indies, Southern Africa, the Seychelles, Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. It is under the control of the Church of England.

The "Scottish Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge," founded in 1709, labored for some years among the North American Indians, but without producing any lasting results.

From 1714 to 1845 the Danish Missions were under the direction of the *Royal Missionary College and Semniary of Copenhagen*. For the missions of East India, under the control of the same college, missionaries trained in Francke's Institute at Halle were as a rule selected; while, for those of *Greenland*, Danish Lutheran ministers were employed from the year 1721 onward. The latter, following in the footsteps of Hans Egede, succeeded in partially civilizing the inhabitants, and converted about ten thousand of them to Christianity.[1] Of the earlier

[1] In 1835 the chief missions of this association were transferred to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and in 1845, with the transfer of the last Danish possessions in India to Great Britain, the labors of the College of Missions there ceased altogether. The Greenland Missions have passed from the control of the Lutherans into the hands of the *Moravians*. (Tr.)

Hosted by Google

evangelical missionaries, the Moravians were at once the most earnest and the most successful.[1] More recently several BRITISH AMERICAN and CONTINENTAL EUROPEAN associations have undertaken to propagate Protestantism among the heathen. The most important of these are: The *Baptist Missionary Society*, founded in 1792; the great *London Missionary Society*, founded in 1795; the *Scotch Missionary Society*, founded at Edinburgh in 1796; and the *Netherlands Missionary Society*, founded at Rotterdam in 1797, mainly through the influence of Dr. Vanderkemp, a missionary in British pay. Of the missionary societies founded since the opening of the present century, the most efficient are the *Church Missionary Society*, in England, organized in 1799; the *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, founded at Boston, U. S., in 1810; the *Wesleyan Missionary Society*, founded at London, England, in 1817; the *Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Society*, founded in 1840; the *Church of Scotland Society*, founded in 1824; the *Free Church of Scotland Society*, founded in 1843; the *United Presbyterian Church of Scotland Society*. Among the other societies established in Great Britain and its colonies are: The Glasgow Missionary Society, in 1796; the United Secession Church's Foreign Mission, 1835; the Glasgow African Mission Society, 1837; the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society, 1841; the Reformed Presbyterian Church's Foreign Mission, 1842; the Loo Choo Naval Mission, 1843; the Patagonian Mission, 1844; the *English Presbyterian*, 1844; the Chinese Evangelization Society, 1850; and the Chinese Society for Furthering the Gospel, 1850. One of the most useful auxiliary societies at work in India is the Christian Vernacular Education Society.

• In zeal for the promotion of the missions, the Continent of Europe has remained far behind England and America. The

[1] The missionary fields which they occupied in succession were the Danish West India Islands (1732), Greenland (1733), North American Indians (1734), Surinam (1735), South Africa (1736, and again in 1792), Jamaica (1754), Antigua (1756), Barbadoes (1765), Labrador (1770), St. Kitt's (1775), Tobago (1790, and again in 1827), the Mosquito coast (1848), Australia (1849), and Thibet (1853). They now count in ninety stations nearly twenty-two thousand communicants. Cf. *Amer. Cyclopaed.*, l. c. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

Dutch society of Rotterdam has already been mentioned. The most extensive of the missionary societies of continental Europe is that of *Basle*, preceded by the establishment of a general missionary seminary in 1815. An independent society, the Evangelical Missionary Society of Basle, was founded in 1821, which now sustains missionaries in West Africa, India, and China. The Basle society at first received the missionary contributions of Protestant Germany; afterward several other societies sprang up. Those exclusively or mainly *Lutheran* are the Berlin Missionary Society, founded in 1824, and supporting a mission in Southern Africa with thirty-one stations and forty-eight laborers; the Evangelical Lutheran Missionary Association of Leipsig, founded in 1836, and occupying in Southern India the former missionary field of the Danes; and the Hermannsburg Society, founded in 1854, which sends out entire missionary colonies, especially to Bechuania and Natal, in South Africa. Among those of *evangelical* tendencies are the following: The Rhenish Missionary Society, founded in 1828; Gossner's Missionary Union, founded in 1836; and the North German Missionary Society, founded in 1836, which have missions in Africa, India, China, the Indian Archipelago, and the South Sea Islands. Special associations for *China* have been formed (from 1816–1849) at Cassel, Barmen, Dresden, Halle, Berlin, and in Pomerania. The *French Reformed Church* has had a missionary society since 1822, which sustains flourishing missions among the *Bassutos* of Southern Africa, where it has now seventeen stations. Norway founded a foreign missionary seminary at Bergen in 1859, and Denmark organized its own missionary society in June, 1860. There are now fifty-two Protestant missionary societies engaged in spreading biblical Christianity among the heathen. These societies collect and spend, in the aggregate, annually over $5,500,000.

As an *aid* to the missionary societies, *Bible Societies* have been organized for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in every tongue. Nearly simultaneously with the foundation of the London Missionary Society in 1804, the *British and Foreign Bible Society* and the *Religious Tract Society* came into ex-

Hosted by Google

istence. They are most important auxiliaries to the various missionary societies, for which they form a sort of center of operations, and have enormous resources at their command. With no desire to detract from the good Christian missionaries have done by translating the Bible and other religious works into many languages, or from the really great contributions they have made to advance knowledge by reducing barbarous tongues to rules and preparing grammars and dictionaries of them, we can not but regard this method of propagating Christianity as liable to many abuses, and as often retarding rather than promoting the work of conversion. First of all, the translations are frequently detestably bad; next, the reading of the *Bible without note* or *comment* is hardly a proper method for a heathen to acquire his first knowledge of Christianity, when Christians themselves, with antecedent Christian traditions in their minds, notoriously disagree as to the proper interpretation to be put upon its words; and, finally, the Deutero-canonical Books are regarded by Protestants as apocryphal, and since the year 1831 have been excluded from the text of their versions. Moreover, great divergencies of opinion exist among missionaries of different sects, which are necessarily fatal to the success of a work, requiring, if any work does, the most complete harmony of belief and unity of action in the ministers engaged in it. To preserve an *appearance* of harmony, the German Missionary Societies began, in 1846, to hold general assemblies at stated intervals, each assembly being held in a different city.

Having thus considered the different missionary organizations of the Protestant world, we will finally pass in review the principal fields of missionary labor, and see what has been accomplished.

The *Baptist Missionary Society*, immediately after its organization, sent missionaries to the north of *India*, Dr. *Carey*, its organizer, being one of its first and most efficient. *Serampore* soon became the center of successful and extensive missionary operations. The Bible, entire or in parts, was issued from the press there in twenty-seven different versions, and numerous schools were opened. The Baptists have at present missions in Western Africa, India, China, and the West

Hosted by Google

Indies, with 423 stations. Missionaries are now sent to India by many other societies, not only of Great Britain, but also of the United States and Continental Europe. The *London Missionary Society* sent its first laborers, twenty-nine carefully selected ministers, to the *South Sea Islands* in 1797, where, after twenty years of difficulty and discouragement, they began to make considerable progress in *Tahiti*, the chief of the *Society Islands*, and subsequently in the other islands also, many of which are now entirely Christian. The gentle manners of the inhabitants predispose them to Christianity and render them amenable to the influences of modern civilization.[1] In the course of time the same society sent missionaries to China, the Islands of the Indian Archipelago, Mauritius, Southern Africa, the West Indies, Guiana, North America, and also to the Island of *Madagascar*, where they made considerable conquests, mainly through the enlightened liberality of King *Radama I.* (fr. 1810), who received them kindly and took them under his protection. They also obtained permission from the King to open schools and set up a printing-press at *Antananarivo*, the central town and capital of the whole island of Madagascar. The persecution waged by Queen *Ranavalona* (fr. 1828 to 1861), to which over 2,000 Christians fell victims, whilst others hid away in woods, could not extinguish Christianity in her dominions. The hopes inspired by the accession of *Radama II.* in 1861 were abruptly terminated by the death of that prince, who perished in a popular tumult two years later. His successor, Queen *Rosaherina*, in a treaty concluded with England, secured liberty of conscience to Christians. The Island of *Mauritius*, which became a dependency of England in 1810, was visited by ministers of the London Missionary Society in 1814, and in 1852 created an Anglican bishopric. The Protestant missions on the Island of Madagascar are directed by authorities resident here, while the Catholic missions on the same great island are conducted from the Island of *Réunion*. The most distinguished of the London Society's missionaries are Dr. *Robert Morrison* and *Karl Gützlaff*,[2] in *China*, and Drs. *Moffat* and *Liv-*

[1] Cf. "*Ausland*," 1842, Nros. 316 and 328.

[2] Born at Pyritz, Pomerania, in 1803, he died in Victoria, Hong Kong, July

Hosted by Google

stone,[1] in Africa. The Anglican *Church Missionary Society* selected as its first missionary field Western Africa. As no

9, 1851. A sonnet, expressive of his earnest wish to become a missionary to the heathen, which he addressed to the King of Prussia, led to his being admitted as a student into the missionary institute conducted by Jänicke, in Berlin. After two years of preparation, he obtained his first appointment from the Dutch Missionary Society at Rotterdam, which sent him to Batavia in 1826. There he married a rich English lady, and during his two years' sojourn in Java he mastered the Chinese language. He then determined to go on his own account to China. Happening in the summer of 1828 to fall in with *Tomlin*, an English missionary stationed at Siam, he went with him to Bangkok, the capital, the aim of both being to perfect themselves in Chinese. Thence Gützlaff, in 1831, undertook a voyage to China, and Macao now became his principal station, where he formed an intimate friendship with *Robert Morrison*. In conjunction with *Medhurst* and two other friends, Gützlaff began a new translation of the Bible into Chinese. With the assistance of Morrison, he founded a society for the diffusion of useful knowledge in China, published a Chinese monthly magazine, and preached at Macao and elsewhere. After the death of Dr. Morrison, in 1834, Gützlaff was appointed chief interpreter to the British superintendency. The difficulties that had grown up between the Chinese and British had obstructed the progress of the missions. During the war he rendered the British army great services as secretary to the British plenipotentiary, and at its close, in 1842, as mediator. In 1844 he organized a society, ostensibly Chinese, for the purpose of carrying Christianity into the interior, through the medium of native agents, and in 1849 visited Europe in behalf of the project. He was finally appointed superintendent of *trade*, which office he held until his death. Gützlaff, besides his translation of Biblical works into various Asiatic languages, wrote in English, "History of the Chinese Empire," London, 1834; "China Opened," 1838; a "Journal of Three Voyages along the Coast of China" (1831–1833); and a "Life of Tao-Kuang," 1851; and in Chinese, "Pro and Contra." Among his German works are: *Allgemeine Länder-und Völkerkunde*, Ningpo, 1843; *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, Stuttgart, 1847. Cfr. *Chambers'* and *American Cyclopaedias*, s. v. (Tr.)

[1] *David Livingstone*, Scotch Presbyterian by birth, carried away by religious enthusiasm for missionary life, studied theology and medicine at Glasgow, and offered his services to the London Society as a missionary to Africa, whither he went in 1840. At Natal he made the acquaintance of a fellow missionary, *Robert Moffat*, whose daughter he afterward married. Soon he proceeded inland to the mission station *Kuruman*, in Bechuania, where he labored till 1849, when he made his first journey in search of *Lake Ngami*, which he discovered on the 1st of August. From 1852–1856 he traversed South Africa from the Cape of Good Hope, by Lake Ngami, to Linyanti; thence to the western coast in lat. 10° S.; then returned to Linyanti; and, after passing through Tete, descended the *Zambesi* to the sea, passing over an estimated distance of 11.000 miles. In 1857 he published in England his first book, entitled "Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa." In 1858 he returned to Africa; went to *Quilimane*, at the mouth of the Zambesi river; and at first traveled N. W., following up the Zambesi river. He then diverged to the north, ex-

Hosted by Google

volunteers could be found in England for this arduous mission, the society commenced its operations with the pupils of *Jänicke's Missionary Institute*, in Berlin. Fifteen German missionaries tried (from 1804 to 1818) to evangelize the *Rio Pongas*, but their efforts were baffled by the deleterious climate and the intrigues of the slave-traders; yet, after 1818, missionary labors were attended with success in *Sierra Leone*. The Church Society erected stations in India, New Zealand, in Rupert's Land around Hudson's Bay, in the West Indies, in China, in Abyssinia, and on the banks of the Niger. In Eastern India an Anglican see was established at *Calcutta* in 1815, and three suffragan sees at *Bombay* and *Madras* in 1833; and finally at *Colombo*, in the island of Ceylon. Much of the success of the missions there is due to the labors of Bishops *Heber* († 1826) and *Wilson*, the latter of whom had all distinction of caste abolished among Christian Hindoos. Still Christianity, though professed by some of the most gifted of the natives, such as the famous Rammohun-Roy, is not making many conquests. After fifty years of labor, all the Protestant denominations, according to the statistical tables of Dr. Mullen, counted in 1862 but 153,000 Christians in India.

The *American Board*, like the London Society, undenominational, but mainly representing the Congregationalists and some of the Presbyterian churches, at present has missions in India, China, Japan, South Africa, Turkey, the *Hawaiian* or Sandwich Islands, the Micronesian Islands, and among the North American Indians. It has been remarkably successful in the Hawaiian Islands (from 1819), the number of members in its churches reaching at one time more than

ploring *Lake Nyassa*, which he discovered in 1859, and afterward explored the country W. and N. W. for a distance of about 300 miles. In 1864, Livingstone returned to England, and next year published "Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries." He immediately set out on another expedition, and nothing was heard of him for years. Finally, the "New York Herald" dispatched Mr. *Stanley*, one of its correspondents, in search of the missing traveler. Mr. Stanley found Livingstone in the autumn of 1871 at Ujiji, alive and well. Livingstone and Stanley together now made a journey to the north end of *Lake Tanganyika*, and were led to conclude that the lake had no communication with the Nile. Mr. Stanley left Livingstone at Unyamyembe in March, 1872, and returned to England. Livingstone afterward reached Lake Bangweolo, near which he died of dysentery, May 4, 1873. (TR.)

Hosted by Google

22,000; the present number is 12,360. Many of the *Society and Sandwich Islands* have embraced Methodism. In recent times, *Methodists* have labored earnestly to convert the inhabitants of the *Fiji* or *Viti Islands*, and in 1857 there were said to be 54,281 attending the service of Wesleyan missionaries.[1] The Methodists have been moderately successful in the kingdom of *Ashantee*, in Africa, and also on the southeast coast.

In North America, the *Methodists* and *Baptists* are only partially successful in their efforts to gain converts, though the German *Lutherans* make considerable progress.

According to the latest statistical reports, Protestant missionary societies support about 5,000 missionaries, scattered in 1,580 different parts of the globe. Without any central authority or common principle of union, representing numerous societies that have no connection with each other, and destitute of the spirit of self-sacrifice which characterizes the true Catholic priest,[2] they have nothing that at all resembles the splendid and elaborate organization of the Catholic missions. But, with all its defects and shortcomings, the missionary zeal displayed in the present and preceding centuries by Protestantism is one of its most attractive and redeeming features.[3]

It is worthy of remark that the rationalists look with disfavor upon all missionary work, because the missionaries are engaged in propagating teachings which in their eyes have no value. Rationalism being of its very nature barren and destitute of every vital principle, has never yet either inspired or produced a great and noble work; and its votaries have never had sufficient faith in their own professions to go

[1] Cf. *Williams* and *Calvert's* Fiji and the Fijians, 2 vols., London, 1858.

[2] The Anglican Church Missionary Society pays every missioner an annual salary of 6,000 francs, 1,000 for his wife, and 500 for every infant child. According to *Rheinwald's* Ecclesiastical Gazette (Berlin, 1840, Nro. 68), the expenses for the Protestant missions were *then* rated at 14,000,000 francs. The Catholic Mission Society, the only one yet in existence in the Church, spent in 1839 only the *ninth* part of that sum.

[3] The Protestants have missionary training schools established at *Gosport* (near Portsmouth), in England (1801); at *Andover* and *Princeton*, in America; at *Berkel*, *Rotterdam* (1810); *Basle* (1815); *Edinburgh* (1820); *Calcutta* (1821); *Paris* (1824); *London* (1825); *Barmen* (1825); *Berlin* (1829).

Hosted by Google

forth and preach them in distant lands or to send others to do so.

The Lutherans of Bavaria showed a similar spirit in designating contributions to the Nürnberg Missionary Society, the wages of sin; but in 1852, when the society passed wholly under Lutheran influence, their opinion underwent a remarkable change.

§ 434. *Catholics and Protestants and their Relations to Each Other.*

Cf. *Historico-Political Papers*, Vol. I., pp. 31–47.

During that predominantly rationalistic period immediately preceding and immediately following the French Revolution, there was a lull in polemic strife between Catholics and Protestants. *Religious indifference*[1] everywhere prevailed; and while some professed Deism and others Atheism, in neither party was religious conviction sufficiently strong or religious feeling sufficiently intense to give occasion to polemic controversy. People had ceased to give any attention to the points of difference that distinguished one creed from another; and, as for the Catholic Church and her institutions, those who made a boast of their superior culture and enlightenment no longer thought it worth while to take any notice of them. If any one desirous of literary notoriety made an assault upon the Church, he did so from a political rather than a dogmatic point of view; or he attacked some particular institution, such as the Society of Jesus, which had been long an object of hatred to parties the most divergent outside the Catholic body.

Planck,[2] already far advanced in years, having had neither share in nor sympathy with the revolutionary movements

[1] Cfr. *Gengler*, Catholicity and Protestantism, or Indulging a Hope of their Lapsing into Indifferentism (*Tübingen Quarterly Review*, 1832, p. 203 sq.) See also Reflections on Indifference, in the *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. VIII., p. 751 sq.

[2] *Planck*, Outlines of a Hist. and Comparative Exposition of Dogmatical Systems, 3d ed., Goettingen, 1822, p. 77–83. Cfr. *Brenner*, The Ignorance and Dishonesty of Lutheran Divines Unmasked, 2d ed., Bamberg, 1830.

Hosted by Google

that convulsed his age, very justly reproached Protestants with their ignorance of Catholicism, telling them, with commendable frankness, that their knowledge of it was little better than a travesty of the truth, and that in studying it they did not take pains to inform themselves by consulting Catholic works and examining Catholic symbols, the only authoritative doctrinal expositions of Catholic faith, but, on the contrary, clung to the old traditionary lies, and, when seeking information on the teachings of the Catholic Church, did so in the works of hostile writers, by whom they were misrepresented. The reproof administered by Planck and *Marheineke* to the Protestants of their day are quite as applicable to the Protestants of our own. Catholic doctrine is as persistently misrepresented and falsified now as then in Protestant catechisms and religious works; among others, in the *Catechism of the Synod of Duisburg*, published in 1843, with a view to give the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants;[1] and Protestant Faculties of Theology, in reporting upon the case of Bruno Bauer, carried their "*evangelical zeal*" to the length of confounding Catholicity with Deism and Naturalism.[2] Professor *Harless*, of Erlangen, a leading Protestant, had the indecency to publish in the *Protestant Journal* (July, 1843, p. 77–86), of which he was the editor, that the Catholic Church is the whore of Babylon, and that Popery was introduced into Hayti amid bloodshed and licentiousness. "Let us therefore pray," he added, "that the Lord may be

[1] Cf. "Veracity and Impartiality of Protestant Text-books," in *The Catholic*, August, 1841, Supplement. The Catholic Clergy of Crefeld opposed to the Duisburg Catechism, a Catechism on the Differential Doctrines, Crefeld, 1844. *Examination* of the Duisburg Catechism by a Catholic Divine, Düsseldorf, 1844. *Truth and its Travesty*, or the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, opposed to the Defense of the Duisburg Catechism, by *H. J. Graeber;* reviewed by Dr. *Henry Rütjes*, 2d ed., Emmerich, 1845. *Baltzer*, The Christian Dogma of Eternal Beatitude, Mentz, 1844. *Idem*, Theological Letters, Mentz, 1844; 2d series, Breslau, 1845.

[2] Opinion of the Prussian Faculties of Protestant Theology on the Licentiate, Bruno Bauer, Berlin, 1842; a sharp reply thereto in *Bruno Bauer's* pamphlet, entitled "The Good Cause of Liberty and My Own Affairs," Zurich, 1843. Criticisms from a *Catholic* point of view, in the *Tübing. Quart. Review* of 1842, p. 163 sq.; and in *The Catholic* of 1844, Sept. nro., p. 115–117.

Hosted by Google

pleased to destroy with the breath of His mouth this corrupting and soul-destroying institution."

Religious controversy between Catholics and Protestants once more ceased almost everywhere during the continuance of the Napoleonic Empire, when the whole German people rose up as a single man, resolved never to sheathe the sword until they had rid their country of the presence of a foreign oppressor; and, again, at the time of the Congress of Vienna, when to become a united people was the one idea that dominated the nations of Germany, a similar absence of controversial rancor was noticeable. But the calm was more apparent than real; for, when the claims of Catholics were brought before the Congress, the treatment they received was a presage of the hostility to the Church displayed at a later day; and, notwithstanding that Catholic princes had united with Protestant princes to form the *Germanic Confederation*, and in spite of the fact that all denominations were secured equal rights by Article XVI. of the Federal Act,[1] Catholics were treated with unjust discrimination, and their expostulations, when made, evaded by the *Diet*, on the ground that it was incompetent to deal with such questions.[2]

The celebration of the ter-centennial jubilee of the Reformation in 1817, and the offensive bearing of Protestants toward Catholics, which it very naturally inspired and fostered, revived the polemical spirit of a former age, and while preachers from their pulpits denounced the Church with vehement bitterness, ultra-Protestant writers assailed her, if possible, still more fiercely through the press. This outburst of religious animosity became general, and acquired a sort of historical importance, from the fact that it impressed upon Catholics a sense of their political rights, strengthened their faith, and intensified their loyalty to the Church. In Saxony, where there exists a perverse disposition to prevent a reconciliation between Protestants and Catholics, the occasion was eagerly

[1] *Article XVI.* reads as follows: "Difference of religion shall not make any difference in the enjoyment of civil and political rights throughout the Germanic Confederation."

[2] On the affair of *Kettenburg*, see "*The Catholic*," June, 1853. See also above, at page 880, note 2, the writings "On Parity in Prussia."

Hosted by Google

seized to create a feeling against the latter on political grounds,[1] a mode of misrepresentation against which an energetic declaration was made by the bishops of England at this very time (1826).[2] The same dishonest tactics were resorted to after the disastrous and fratricidal war of 1866, and again with intensified virulence after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 and 1871. On the former occasion the Supreme Protestant Consistory of Baden was seriously compromised; and on the latter the Catholic clergy of Prussia, than whom there is not a more loyal body of men in the Empire, and notably the *Jesuits and other Religious Orders* of both sexes, and even the *bishops*, were subjected, under the Falk laws of May 11, 1873, to deprivation, fines, imprisonment, and exile. These laws, ostensibly enacted to protect the rights of the State, have obviously no excuse for their existence other than that of paralyzing the energies and extinguishing the life of the Catholic Church. In vain did a farseeing Swiss tell the Germans, on a solemn occasion at Frankfort in 1862, "to cease their religious conflicts, because," said he, "*they are the death of Protestantism, and will render abortive all your efforts at union.*"

The most violent personal attack which these religious controversies called forth was that made by *John Henry Voss*,[3] a Dutchman, on *Stolberg*,[4] his former friend, a circumstance which rendered the offense unpardonable, and for no reason other than that the latter saw fit to exercise the Protestant prerogative of private judgment and become a Catholic. The indignant rejoinders of Catholic writers were of a character to fire the courage of the most listless and apathetic of their

[1] *Tzschirner*, Protestantism and Catholicism from a Political Point of View, 4th ed., Lps. 1824. Abbot *M. Prechtl* answered it by his Examination of Tzschirner's Pamphlet, Sulzbach, 1823. Remarks of a Prussian Protestant on Tzschirner's Onslaught on the Catholic Church, Offenburg, 1824. Another Examination of Tzschirner's Pamphlet, by *William von Schütz*, 1827.

[2] See § 403, p. 733 sq.

[3] *Voss*, How did Fred. Stolberg become a Slave? Sophronizon, 1819, Vol. III. Correspondence between H. Voss and Jean Paul.

[4] *Stolberg*, Reply to the Libel of Aulic Councillor Voss, Hamburg, 1820. Cfr. Stolberg and Dr. Paulus, of Heidelberg (by *Fr. Geiger*), Mentz, 1820. Stolberg and Sophronizon, or The Good Faith of Doctor Paulus, Mentz, 1821. *Hasert*, Was I the Devil's Imp when I turned Catholic? Bunzlau, 1854.

Hosted by Google

co-religionists. For a time the periodical press of Germany introduced offensive personalities into polemical discussions, and converts to Catholicity were made objects of satire and ridicule in romances written expressly for the purpose;[1] but as the treatment of so momentous a subject in so flippant a manner was out of harmony with the staid gravity of the German character, it received scant encouragement, and was finally abandoned. Polemics then assumed a purely scientific character, and this date marks the opening of the controversy on *Symbolism*, or the historical exposition of the various religious systems and formularies of faith. *Marheineke*[2] assures us that his chief object in publishing his Symbolism was to correct "the deep-seated and deplorable ignorance, not only of Protestant laymen, but also of certain theologians and canonists, concerning Catholic teaching, which was most absurdly misrepresented." But, in spite of the best intentions, Marheineke fell into the very fault which he so severely rebuked in others, misstating many points of Catholic doctrine. The writings of *Winer*,[3] *Guericke*, *Marsh*, *Planck*, *Koellner*, *Thiersch*, and in a measure those of *Boehmer*, are marred by the same blemish, though not to the same degree. To the surprise of every one, *Charles Hase* went out of his way in his *Polemics*, a work of little value, to revive the old

[1] *Bretschneider*, Henry and Antonio. The author of a pamphlet entitled "Baron von Sandau Reinstated in the Tribunal of Sound Criticism," Lps. 1839. p. 105, justly observes "*that works of such a character will pervert the judgment of indifferent thinkers and scholars for a half a century.*"

[2] *Planck*, Outlines of a Historical and Comparative Exposition of the Dogmatical Systems, 3d ed., Goettingen, 1822. *Marheineke*, System of Catholicism, or Comparative Exposition of Doctrine (or Symbolism), III. Pts., Heidelberg, 1810–1814.

[3] *Winer*, Comparative Exposition of the Doctrine of Different Christian Denominations, Lps. 1824. *Klausen*, Constitutions and Rites of Catholicism and Protestantism; transl. fr. the Danish into German, 2 vols., Neustadt, 1828. *Guericke*, General Christian Symbolism, Lps. 1839. *Marsh*, Comparative Exposition of the Anglican and Roman Churches; transl. fr. the English into Germ. by Dr. *Eisele*, Grimma, 1848. *Köllner*, Symbolism of the Christian Denominations, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1837–1844. *Thiersch*, Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism, Erlangen, 1846. *Matthes*, Comparative Symbolism of all the Christian Denominations, Lps. 1854. *Baier*, Symbolism of the Christian Denominations, Greifswalde and Lps. 1854 sq. *Böhmer*, The Differential Doctrines of the Catholic and Evangelical Churches, 2 vols., Berlin, 1857 sq.

Hosted by Google

quarrels and stir up fresh hatred between Catholics and Protestants; but having done so, he had no right to complain of the acrimonious tone of the replies which so unprovoked an assault called forth.[1]

After remaining for a long time on the defensive,[2] Catholics assumed an emphatically aggressive attitude, which culminated in *Moehler's* splendid work on Symbolism, the decisive influence of which on theological science and the development of Catholicity has been already described. Much against the author's will, he was forced in his controversy with his adversaries to abandon the pacific and dignified language of science, and to speak of them in terms of indignant rebuke.[3] When such was the spirit that animated both parties, it is not surprising that the "Catastrophe of Cologne" should have occasioned between Catholics and Protestants a controversy so violent that it raged furiously between even members of the same family. While, on the one hand, Protestants revived the old calumnies against the Church and her institutions,[4] and reproached Catholics themselves with being *intolerant;* Catholics, on the other, charged Protestants with having lowered the standard of religious controversy by stripping it of its scientific character and making it a pretext for revolutionary movements, and of having inspired the iniquitous enactments by which Catholics are even at the present day deprived of their rights and reduced to the condition of slaves

[1] *Hase*, Polemics against the Roman Catholic Church, Lps. 1862; 2d ed., '65; 3d, '71. Replies in the "Episcopal Letter" of *Bishop Conrad*, of Paderborn; in "*The Catholic*," 1864, Vol. I., p. 277–310; by *Dieringer;* by *Schulte*, Man-traps for Protestants, Paderborn, 1865. Cfr. Vienna General Literary Gazette, 1865, Nro. 16. *Speil*, The Doctrines of the Catholic Church in opposition to Protestant Polemics, Freiburg, 1865. From a different point of view: *Clarus*, Literary Sports, Paderborn, 1866.

[2] See p. 865.

[3] *Moehler*, Symbolism, etc.; see pp. 608 sq. His chief opponents were Baur, Nitzsch, and Marheineke. Later on, *Hilgers* wrote Symbolical Theology, Bonn, 1841; *Buchmann*, Popular Symbolism, Mentz, 1843; and *Thomas Moore*, Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion, 1833.

[4] It was said that converts to Catholicity, in making their confession of faith, were obliged to heap maledictions upon their Protestant relatives, and that the bull "*In Coena Domini*" is still read annually, both of which statements were knowingly *false*, and the former wickedly dishonest.

Hosted by Google

in *Denmark*, *Sweden*,[1] and other countries, and forbidden to ring the bells on their churches in the Reformed Cantons of Zürich, Basle, etc., though no such restrictions are placed upon Calvinists in the Catholic Canton of Soleure.

At this time it was thought the Protestant King of Holland was about to break his engagement with the Countess of d'Oultremont, who was a *Catholic*. The news was hailed with joy by Protestants throughout the country, and the *Handelsblad*, one of their leading newspapers, forgetful of the tolerance of which it professed to be a champion, in commenting on it, did so in these exultant words:[2] "The King has won a victory over himself. Netherlanders rejoice, in that he has gained a triumph such as few of those heroes whose fame fills the world have achieved." In accord with this spirit of intolerance was the conduct of *Eisenlohr*, the Protestant ecclesiastical counsellor of the Catholic metropolis of Freiburg, in Baden, who, contrary to all precedent, assembled his congregation in church on the Feast of Corpus Christi, "*for the purpose*," as he announced to them from the pulpit, "*of withdrawing them from the infection of Catholic idolatry*." Abundant examples of the same spirit might be given, but we will only advert, in passing to the bitter and unjustifiable assaults upon Mgr. *Laurent*, on the occasion of his appointment as Bishop of Hamburg; to the reckless denunciations of Queen Victoria by the Tory newspapers, because of a few trifling concessions made to the Catholics of the kingdom; to the No-Popery cry raised when the Catholic hierarchy was restored to England in 1850 and to Holland in 1853; to the senseless clamor against the Austrian Concordat in 1855 and the ignorant misrepresentation of the definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin in the preceding year; to the dishonest tactics employed against Superintendent *Hurter*[3] by

[1] There are some remarkable extracts from the "*Faedrelandet*," reproduced in the *Augsburg Universal Gazette* of 1840, No. 34. As to Sweden, see *Cath. Eccl. Gaz.*, 1840, Nos. 34, 37, and 56. Cf. *Sion*, 1841, No. 57.

[2] In the number of March 24, 1840. Cf. *Cath. Eccl. Gaz.*, by Hoenighaus, 1840, No. 35.

[3] *Hurter*, Antistes of Schaffhausen and His so-called Professional Brethren, Schaffhausen, 1840.

Hosted by Google

his so-called *Professional Brethren*; to the Charlestown and Philadelphia riots of 1834 and 1844;[1] to the indecent ribaldry against the Pope, the Church, and things Catholic, evoked by the Rougian comedy; to the wicked fabrication of formularies of faith and forms of recantation ascribed to Catholics; and, finally, to the systematic and tyrannous repression of freedom of conscience in Switzerland, and to the slanderous misrepresentations of everything Catholic officially enunciated at the *ecclesiastical synods* of Berlin, Wiesbaden, Bremen, Frankfort, *Stuttgart*, and other cities.

It must, however, be frankly confessed that there has been no lack of stinging words and irritating conduct on *either* side. Since it is inevitable that controversies must arise among people holding and acting upon opposite religious principles, it is eminently desirable that they should be conducted with moderation and dignity, and be allowed to disturb as little as possible the amenities of social life. In view of the determined effort everywhere being made to obscure, and, if possible, utterly destroy *the supernatural character of the Christian and every other religion, to ignore the controling providence of God in the affairs of men and nations, and to reject the divine authority on which dogmatic verities are based*, it is but a simple and imperative duty with Catholics and such Protestants as still believe in a revelation and profess a faith to unite in defending and preserving the inestimable treasure of revealed truth. But, above all, let the younger clergy understand and take it seriously to heart that it is in a special sense their mission to demonstrate the truth and set it clearly before the minds of the people; to dwell upon the grandeur of the Church and the divine power residing in her; and to show that whenever and wherever she has been free she has been quick to discover and prompt to minister to the wants of the human family. In this way they will conciliate and attract minds now alienated from her, and contribute to soothe the asperities of polemic strife and remove the obstacles that divide Christendom outside the Catholic Church into a multi-

[1] The Philadelphia Riot, *Hist.* and *Polit. Papers*, Vol. XIII., pp. 837 sq.

Hosted by Google

tude of conflicting sects.[1] The same advice was given by *Stark* in 1809 in his *Banquet of Theodulus*, a work written in excellent temper, with the laudable design of conciliating Christians of every profession.

There are numerous signs which go to show that the divided state of Christendom is becoming irksome to reflecting minds; and many honest Protestants, if they do not at once enter the Catholic Church,[2] are disposed to listen patiently to her claims and judge them impartially.[3] It is not surprising, therefore, that *Brenner*[4] and *Hoeninghaus*,[5] in traveling through Protestant countries, found many of the inhabitants well disposed toward the Church. It is also a promising sign to find en-

[1] According to the *statistical report* given in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of Vienna for the year 1853, the number of the various Christian denominations of the world are as follows: Latin Catholics, 194,500,000; Greek Catholics, 4,500,000; Armenian Catholics, 200,000; Maronite Catholics, 530,000; Syrian Catholics (United Jacobites), 35,000; Chaldean Catholics (United Nestorians), 20,000; Koptic Catholics, 15,000; Syro-Chaldaic Catholics (United Thomist Christians, cf. §§ 123 and 124), 200,000; total number of *Catholics*, 200,000,000. Schismatic Greeks, 64,000,000; Schismatic Armenians, 3,000,000; Schismatic Abyssinians, 1,800,000; Schismatic Syrians, 500,000; Koptic Monophysites, 200,000; Syro-Chaldaic Thomist Christians, 100,000; Chaldaic Nestorians, 500,000; Roscolnics, embracing 30 sects, 5,000,000; total *Oriental Schismatical* and *non-Catholic Christians*, 75,100,000. Protestants are divided into 40 larger and 110 lesser parties. The Lutherans number 18,000,000; the Anglicans, 15,000,000; the so-called United Evangelicals, i. e. Lutherans and Calvinists united by the State, 12,000,000; German, Dutch, and Helvetic Calvinists, 7,000,000; Methodists, 6,000,000; Presbyterians and Calvinist Baptists, 5,000,000; and the remaining sects, 12,000,000; total *Protestant Christians*, 80,000,000, or, according to more recent reports, 89,000,000. For an accurate statistical statement concerning the Catholic Church, see The Catholic Bishoprics of the World, by *Braumers*, Bergheim, 1861; and the *Annuario Pontificio*, now called *La Gerarchia Cattolica*, published yearly at Rome. Cf. *Neher*, Ecclesiastical Geography and Statistics, Ratisbon, 1865–1868, 3 vols.

[2] *Arendt* (private lecturer at the Protestant faculty of Bonn; died professor of philosophy at Louvain), Statement of the Motives of my Conversion to the Catholic Church, Spire, 1832; Hist. of Pope Leo the Great, Mentz, 1835.

[3] *Stark*, * The *Banquet of Theodulus*, or The Re-union of the Different Christian Communions, 7th ed., Frankfort, 1827; Engl. transl., Baltimore, 1868. The *Correspondence* of Theodulus, Frankfort, 1828.

[4] *Brenner*, Flashes of Light among Protestants, or New Confessions of the Truth made by its Adversaries, Bamberg, 1830.

[5] *Hoenighaus*, Result of my Travels through Protestant Territory, or Necessity of Returning to the Catholic Church, Aschaffenburg (1835), 1837.

Hosted by Google

lightened Protestants, whether ministers or laymen, using themselves and recommending to others *Catholic* works of devotion and instruction, such as the *Following of Christ*, *Spiritual Voices of the Middle Ages*,[1] *Massillon's Charges* or Conferences on the Duties of the Clergy,[2] the *Pensées* of Pascal,[3] and the Sermons of *Berthold*, a Franciscan friar, of *John Tauler*,[4] and others. It would seem, therefore, that the conviction is steadily deepening and widening that the Catholic Church has at all times had a high and majestic conception of Christianity, and that Catholicity itself has been shamefully misrepresented by the inveterate prejudice and ignorant hostility of its adversaries, a fact to which *Ludolph von Beckedorf* has drawn public attention and dwelt upon with forcible and dignified earnestness.[5] Moreover, the more noble, single-minded, and religious of Protestants are precisely those who, like the Prodigal Son, begin to revive the memory of the wealth of blessings their forefathers enjoyed in the Catholic Church, and to yearn for an inheritance that should be theirs. They listen to the inspiring chants of the Church, assist at her religious offices, and witness the beautiful and touching rites and customs that appeal to eye and ear and heart in the administration of Baptism, Holy Eucharist, Confirmation, Marriage, Penance, and Extreme Unction,[6] and, turning sorrowfully away, grieve that they too are not in the House of their Father. And, while in many places *pictures* and *statues* are being quietly set up in the churches, and the beautiful Catholic practice of ringing the *Angelus* at sunrise, midday, and sunset is being again introduced, in others the proposal to

[1] *Galle*, Spiritual Voices of the Middle Ages, Halle, 1841.

[2] *Massillon's* Charges, Eccl. Conferences and Synodal Discourses and Episcopal Mandates on the Principal Duties of the Clergy; Engl. transl., by the Rev. C. H. Boylan, in 2 vols., dedicated to Bp. John McHale, Dublin, 1825; Germ. transl., by *Reineck*, Magdeburg. 1835–1836, 2 vols.

[3] *Pascal*, Pensées sur la religion; Germ. by *Blech*, with preface by *Neander*, Berlin, 1835; several times transl. into English; the original ed. of 1670, with illustrations by Gaucherel, reprinted in 1874.

[4] Cf. Vol. II., p. 1035, note 2.

[5] *L. von Beckedorf*, A Few Words of Peace and Reconciliation, 3d ed., Ratisbon, 1852.

[6] *Hengstenberg's* Evangelical Church Gazette, October 29, 1856. Further details, *Jörg's* Hist. of Protestantism, Vol. I., p. 445–555.

Hosted by Google

make *liturgical ceremonies*, *auricular confession*, and *extreme unction* part of divine service has given occasion to animated discussion, and at times to unseemly struggles. These innovations were attempted at Breslau and Stuttgart by the Consistorial Counsellors, *Böhmer* and *Kapp;* and in England an effort was made to restore the *Sacrament of Confirmation* and the ancient catechumenate.

We may enumerate here, and we do so with pleasure, a few of the many works in which Protestants have emulated the zeal of Catholics. These are the propagation of Christianity, the abolition of slavery, the care of the sick and the needy, and the cultivation of the various branches of Christian art. If the restoration of the cathedrals of Ratisbon, Bamberg, Spire, Cologne, Strasburg, and other cities is due to the artistic skill, enlightened taste, and splendid generosity of the Catholics, the restoration of the churches of St. Elizabeth at Marburg, of Our Lady at Esslingen, and of the Cathedral of Basle, not to mention others, is due to the same qualities on the part of Protestants; while a multitude of new structures have been erected by both.

§ 435. *Conclusion.*

We have now brought to a close the work we proposed to ourselves, which was to draw with all possible fidelity an outline of the History of the Church in her foundation and the principal phases of her development; in her growth and conflicts; in her sufferings and victories; and, finally, in the triumphant maintenance of her unchangeable teachings against the ever-shifting forms of heresy.

We have seen that she was prefigured in the Old Testament; that she was established by Christ and made prolific by the blood of the Martyrs; that for a time she remained in obscurity, seeking a refuge in the dwellings of private individuals and an asylum in the Catacombs, but only to come forth at a later day triumphant and glorious; that she was victorious over Rome, its idols, and its emperors; that she became the civilizer of the barbarian hordes of the North and

Hosted by Google

the queen and mistress of the nations, which submitted with joyful alacrity to her spiritual authority, vested in St. Peter and his successors; that she has ever been the patron of the arts and sciences and the guardian of true liberty; that she has been unceasingly in conflict with error, superstition, and every form of unbelief, and has uniformly vanquished them all, and come forth unharmed from the struggle; that when borne down with grief by the betrayal and desertion of her own children, she has been consoled and gladdened by the accession of strangers to her fold, who have rivaled her most generous sons in the loyalty of their attachment; that she has stood firm and unshaken amid the malignant persecutions which she has endured in every age and country; that every species of force and every manner of weapon have been used against her, and that she, strong in the strength of her unchangeable doctrine, her unity of constitution, and her abiding and reliant faith in the promises of God, has successfully resisted them all, and by the incomparable majesty of her institutions, the number, variety, and beneficent character of her works, and the heroic devotion of her ministers, has proven herself superior to violence and fearless of aggression; that, though not affected by the periodical changes of the times and inaccessible to them, she alone has fully comprehended the wants of successive ages, and has been alone capable of adequately supplying them; that, while rising above the intrigues, the animosities, and the struggles of social and political revolutions, she has stilled the fierce passions that they evoked and healed the rankling wounds that they inflicted; and, finally, we have seen that she has everywhere and always faithfully labored to accomplish the work committed to her of converting the heathen and bringing all men to God by subduing all to the light and easy yoke of Jesus Christ. The numerous figures foreshadowing the promised work of man's redemption, and the long series of events, commencing with the beginnings of time and leading up to it, found their realization, perfection, and maturity in the Church, of which Jesus Christ is the head, who, on this very account, has ever been and must ever be the *center of the political history of the world.* The foundation of the Church marked a *new era*, the charac-

Hosted by Google

teristics of which are legible on every page of the world's history from that day to this. In the Church all nations have sought and found freedom, peace, and order. Alike in their prosperity and in their adversity, in their pride and in their humiliation, they have been objects of her tender care and loving solicitude. She sympathizes with them in their struggles, rejoices in their victories, mourns over their disasters, and hails their regeneration with exultant gladness. The mediatrix between earth and heaven, she is the link uniting the perishable with the everlasting; and glorifying God in mankind, she prepares mankind for the fullness of glory in God through Jesus Christ.

The guide of nations and peoples, she places herself at their head, and, leading them on to the full light of the Gospel, unites them all under the one standard of the Cross. Having subsisted from the beginning, she will continue indefectible to the end, a glorious Church, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, because she has been founded by the power of the Most High; has never for a moment, from the days of the Apostles to our own, been shut out from the light of God's countenance or the sweetness of His love; and has labored ceaselessly and assiduously to sanctify the world through the abiding presence and active influence of the Holy Ghost. That she is still the Spouse of Christ and bears upon her the tokens of divinity, and that her children are as believing and obedient in this as in any former age, the circumstances attending the celebration at Rome of the eighteenth centenary of the death of St. Peter, on the 29th of June, 1867, furnish the most abundant proof; while, at the same time, they have given an impulse to faith all over the Christian world, and have pointedly rebuked the unbelief so characteristic of these latter days. And what she has done in time past, if one may trust the signs now rising above the horizon, she will do in *time to come* for the nations of the earth. Weary of their long and cheerless wanderings, they will again lift up their hearts in hope; turn with wistful gaze toward the Cross, resplendent and triumphant; and seek a remedy for the evils that threaten social and political life with dissolution in the Church of Christ, whose fondest care it has ever been to minister to the

Hosted by Google

wounds of mankind with more than a mother's tenderness, and to relieve pain and suffering with the balm that oozes out of the tree of the Cross and the soothing potency of apostolic words. In *Great Britain*, in *America*, and in *France*,[1] the movement has already begun. The people of these countries are returning in throngs, like erring but now repentant children, to the bosom of their long deserted mother; and the morning star of Christianity is once more rising over the *peoples of Islam*, whose mission in history seems to have come to end.[2]

Blessed be Our Lord Jesus Christ in and through His Church, and may He hasten the day when Catholics and Protestants, *united* in one fold and under one Shepherd, will praise and bless the *Son of God* with accordant voice, and, in the full consciousness of past shortcomings and the forgiving generosity of present joy, cry out: "We have all something to reproach ourselves with in time gone by; but now, putting all differences aside, we confess that *the Church*, the Immaculate Spouse of Christ, through her Infallible Head, is and has ever been and ever will be unerring in her teachings and holy in her practice. Having strayed from the right road in the past, we desire for the future to labor solely for God's honor and glory." This frank confession of faults on both sides, different indeed in character, but faults none the less, will be succeeded by a great feast of reconciliation, and

[1] Witness the recent establishment and *endowment by private munificence* of *six free Catholic universities*, viz., of Paris, Lille, Poitiers, Lyons, Angers, and Toulouse. (Tr.)

[2] *Weil*, in his Historical and Critical Introduction to the Koran, speaks in these words of the future of the Islam: "If it be asked what will be the future of Islam, and by what means will it reach the high degree of civilization at which Europe has arrived, we think we may reply that it will follow in every respect the course already traversed by Judaism. It will separate tradition from revelation, properly so called, and establish in its Sacred Books a broad distinction between eternal verities and simple prescriptions. Its absorption with Christianity will be the more easy, from the fact that Mohammed himself assigns to Christ and the Blessed Virgin a higher rank than do even a great many Protestants. Rationalism is a necessary step in the conversion of both Jew and Moslem; but, once they have reached this point, they appreciate the necessity of a positive law, and go straight into the Catholic Church."

Hosted by Google

the differences of centuries will be utterly forgotten in the flood of heavenly joy that will sweep over all hearts once more united in the loving Heart of Jesus.

Already Protestants have joined in generous rivalry with Catholics in building up the twin towers of the majestic Cathedral of Cologne, where bells are destined to be hung whose peals will ring out upon the air of Germany, carrying the soothing music of their sounds into every city and hamlet, to summon the entire people, once more united as in pre-Reformation days, to the service and the temple of the living God, and to fellowship with the great Catholic family.[1]

But, alas! there are still many nations nearly, if not wholly, estranged from Christianity, which can enter the kingdom of God only through great tribulation.[2] Even in Europe the now dominant Liberals and Freemasons have entered upon a malignant and systematic persecution of the Church, have set themselves to the diabolical work of destroying all positive faith, and have caused laws to be enacted by which priests are subjected for imaginary offenses to heavy fines, imprisonment, and exile; Religious Orders expelled; and other measures equally iniquitous carried out under pretense of providing for the well-being of the State. These persecutions, however, will serve to purify the Church, to renew her strength, and give her fresh beauty. Let hatred be as satanic as it may and wickedness as malignant, they will both prove ineffectual against the Church. There resides a power within her that is not of man, but of God, and though her triumph may be delayed, it is sure to be glorious in the end. The

[1] *Wolfgang Menzel*, reviewing a number of writings on the Cologne Cathedral (in the Literary Fly-leaf of his Morning Gazette, 1843, Nros. 1, 2, 3), uses words of similar import; and Frederick William IV., in laying the first stone for the resumption of work on the same cathedral, spoke of "the feelings of brotherly love which the various denominations should bear toward each other, inasmuch as they were all one, being united under Divine Head."

[2] Acts xiv. 21. "Will Germany become Catholic?" by the author of Inquiries concerning Catholicism, Protestantism, and Liberty of Conscience, Schaffhausen, 1859. Return to the Catholic Church the Problem of the Age, by a Protestant, Leipsig, 1851.

Hosted by Google

Spirit of Truth will once more move over the face of the earth; man's soul will be enlightened, renewed, beautified by grace; materialism, seen in all its grossness and hideous ugliness, will evoke only feelings of loathing disgust, and mankind will turn again in repentant gladness to God.

END OF VOLUME THIRD.

Hosted by Google

I. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

POPES AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS.

Being a continuation of Vol. II., p. 1072.

POPES.	EMPERORS.
Hadrian VI. 1522–1523 (a Netherlander).	
Clement VII. 1523–1534.	Charles V. 1519–1556.
Paul III. 1534–1549.	
Julius III. 1550–1555.	
Marcellus II. (only 21 days.)	
Paul IV. 1555–1559.	Ferdinand I. 1556–1564.
Pius IV. 1559–1565.	Maximilian II. 1564–1576.
St. Pius V. 1566–1572.	
Gregory XIII. 1572–1585.	Rudolph II. 1576–1612.
Sixtus V. 1585–1590.	
Urban VII. (13 days.)	
Gregory XIV. (10 months and 10 days.)	
Innocent IX. 1591 (a little more than 2 months).	
Clement VIII. 1592–1605.	
Leo XI. (27 days.)	
Paul V. 1605–1621.	Matthias, 1612–1619.
Gregory XV. 1621–1623.	Ferdinand II. 1619–1637.
Urban VIII. 1623–1644.	Ferdinand III. 1637–1657.
Innocent X. 1644–1655.	
Alexander VII. 1655–1667.	Leopold I. 1657–1705.
Clement IX. 1667–1669.	
Clement X. 1670–1676.	
Innocent XI. 1676–1689.	
Alexander VIII. 1689–1691.	
Innocent XII. 1691–1700.	
Clement XI. 1700–1721.	Joseph I. 1705–1711.
Innocent XIII. 1721–1724.	Charles VI. 1711–1740.
Benedict XIII. 1724–1730.	
Clement XII. 1730–1740.	

Hosted by Google

POPES.	EMPERORS.
**Benedict XIV.* 1740–1758.	Maria Teresa and her consort, Francis I. 1740–1765.
Clement XIII. 1758–1769.	(Charles VII. 1742–1745, Pretender.)
Clement XIV. 1769–1774.	Maria Teresa and her son, Joseph II. 1765–1780.
Pius VI. 1775–1799.	Joseph II. 1780–1790.
Pius VII. 1800–1823.	Leopold II. 1790–1792.
Leo XII. 1823–1829.	Francis II. 1792–1806, when the German Empire was dissolved.
Pius VIII. 1829–1830.	
Gregory XVI. 1831–1846.	
Pius IX. 1846–1878.	
Leo XIII. 1878.	

Hosted by Google

II. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE

MOST IMPORTANT PERSONAGES AND EVENTS DURING THE THIRD PERIOD (1517–1878), FIRST EPOCH (1517–1648).

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1513–1521. Pope *Leo X.*, in 1517, has an indulgence preached in behalf of the erection of St. Peter's church. The Dominican, *Tetzel*, preaches the indulgence in the States of the Elector and Archbishop of Mentz.

1517. On the 31st of October, Luther, preacher and professor at the University of Wittenberg, affixes ninety-five propositions on indulgences to the doors of the church. A reply, written by the Dominican, Sylvester Prierias, appears shortly after.

1518. In the month of April, on the occasion of the meeting of a General Chapter of the Augustinians at Heidelberg, Luther freely avows anti-Catholic propositions, forming the foundation of his subsequent teachings, and wins over to his cause Bucer, Schnepf, and Brenz; he comes, later on, before the Diet of Augsburg, presents himself before Cardinal Cajetan, and appeals from the Pope ill informed to the Pope better instructed. The Pope appoints Promagister Gabriel General *pro tem.* of the Augustinians. At Danzig the monk, James Knade, preaches in the spirit of Luther.

1519. Death of Emperor Maximilian. Frederic the Wise is appointed Regent of the Empire. Luther presents himself before Miltitz at Altenburg. Disputation at Leipsig (June 27–July 16) between Eck, Carlstadt, and Luther. Notwithstanding Eck's victory over Luther, the latter wins over to his cause Melanchthon, and also the turbulent and dissipated nobles of the times (Ulrich von Hutten, Francis of Sickingen), whom he professes to regard as angels sent for his service. Olaf and Lawrence Peterson create an agitation in Sweden in favor of Lutheranism. In Switzerland, Zwingli opposes Bernard Samson, a preacher of indulgences. Charles V., Emperor, 1519–1556.

1520. Papal bull of excommunication against Luther. Dr. Eck and the Papal Legates, Carraccioli and Aleandro. Luther publishes inflammatory religious and political writings, such as the "*Address to the Christian Nobles of Germany;*" "*On the Babylonish Captiv-*

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

ity;" "*On Christian Liberty;*" and "*Against the Bull of Antichrist;*" and, finally, on the 10th of December, he burns, together with the papal bull, the Canon Law, many scholastic and casuistical works, and the controversial writings of his adversaries.

1521. Luther comes before the Diet of Worms; decree issued against him; his retirement to the castle of Wartburg (Patmos). *Loci theologici* of Melanchthon. Disturbances at Wittenberg, occasioned by Carlstadt, Storch, Thomas Münzer, and others.

1522. Luther declares against the Visionaries of Wittenberg. Brenz preaches Lutheranism at Hall, in Suabia. Henry VIII. publishes a work against Luther. The writings of the latter are spread through Hungary and Transylvania.

1522–1523. *Hadrian VI.* His Declaration at the Diet of Nürnberg through his Legate, *Chieregati*, and his View of Luther. Bucer and Capito preach Lutheranism at Strasburg. Disputation at Zürich (January, 1523) between Faber and Zwingli, in consequence of which the latter wins over to his side Leo Judae and Hetzer. Margrave Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, invites the Lutheran preachers, John Brismann and Peter Amandus, to come into his States. The Bishops of Samland and Pomesania publicly join their party in 1524. In Sweden, Gustavus Vasa avails himself of Lutheranism to obtain his ends. Bugenhagen, preacher at Wittenberg.

1523–1534. *Clement VII.*, Pope. His relations to the Emperor Charles V. and Francis I., King of France.

1524. Weakness of the Diet of Nürnberg at the moment of its close. Catholic alliance between Austria and Bavaria, participated in by twelve bishops of Southern Germany. Violent quarrel between Luther and Carlstadt on the Eucharist. Scene in the Black Bear inn of Jena. Controversy between Luther and Erasmus on Free Will. Establishment of the Order of Theatines by Caraffa.

1525. The Peasants' War spreads throughout Germany. Base conduct of Luther and Melanchthon on this occasion. Continuation of the Controversy with Erasmus on the Eucharist. Luther marries, and arbitrarily abolishes the Canon of the Mass. Death of Frederic the Wise. John the Constant. Eck publishes his *Enchiridion locorum communium adv. Lutherum*, and Zwingli his *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione.*

1526. Lutheran alliance of Torgau. Religious conference of Homburg. Denmark declares in favor of Lutheranism, in consequence of the intrigues of Christiern II. (1513–1523) and Frederic I. Margrave Albert marries the daughter of the King of Denmark. Secularization of the Duchy of Prussia.

1527. Capture and plunder of Rome by the Imperialists. Diet of Odensee in Denmark. Hypocrisy of Gustavus Vasa at the Diet of Westeraes. At Basle, the adherents of Oecolampadius obtain

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

through menaces the free exercise of their worship. The Antwerp Polyglot published by Catholics.

1528. Berthold Haller preaches the new doctrines at Berne. Parochial visitation in Saxony. The Order of Capuchins is confirmed by Pope Clement VII. The *German Theology*, written by Bishop Berthold, of Chiemsee. Patrick Hamilton burnt in Scotland for having there propagated heretical teachings.

1529. The Assembly of Oerebro accomplishes the work of Reformation in Sweden. Diet of Spire, where the Reformers receive the name of *Protestants*. Conference of the Lutherans at Copenhagen.

1530. Diet of Augsburg. The *Augsburg Confession*, composed by Melanchthon, to which Faber, Eck, and Cochlaeus oppose a Catholic refutation. Melanchthon's *Apologia*. Establishment at Milan of the Order of Barnabites, which is confirmed in 1532.

1531. League of Schmalkald entered into by the Protestants. Zwingli and Oecolampadius perish during the war of religion, which breaks out in Switzerland. Matthias Devay preaches in Hungary, first Lutheranism, and soon thereafter Zwinglianism.

1532. Religious peace of Nürnberg. Death of John the Constant, who is replaced by John Frederic the Magnanimous.

1533. Shameful disorders of the Anabaptists at Münster. Negotiations in behalf of a General Council.

1534. Henry VIII. separates from Rome, because the Pope refuses to sanction his adulterous marriage. Luther publishes a complete translation of the Bible, at which he had been working since 1522. Oath of supremacy. Thomas Cranmer is appointed vicar general. Calvin at Basle.

1534–1549. *Paul III.*, Pope. His efforts, through his Nuncio, Vergerius, to assemble an Ecumenical Council.

1535. The disorders of the Anabaptists put down at Münster. The Reformation is established at Geneva, through the efforts of Farel and Viret.

1536. Death of Erasmus at Basle. Calvin publishes his "*Institutes of the Christian Religion*," *dedicated to Francis I., King of France*, and establishes himself at Geneva. Bucer and Melanchthon conjointly bring about the *Concordia Vitebergensis*. Pope Paul III.'s encyclica, calling an Ecumenical Council to convene at Mantua in 1537, is unsuccessful.

1537. The Protestant Assembly of Schmalkald carries its hatred of the Pope to the very verge of frenzy. The twenty-three "Articles of Schmalkald" present a striking contrast with the Augsburg Confession. Melanchthon's treatise, entitled *De potestate et primatu Papae*. Angela de' Merici ("of Brescia") founds the Order of Ursulines. Bugenhagen, Superintendent General of Saxony from 1536, repairs to Denmark, crowns the King and the Queen, and succeeds in establishing the Reformation. Antinomian controversy between Luther and Agricola, 1537–1540.

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1538. The *Holy League* of the Catholic Princes is formed through the efforts of *Held*, Vice-Chancellor to the Emperor. Calvin is driven from Geneva on account of his violence.

1539. Death of Duke George of Saxony. Henry, his brother, successor, establishes Lutheranism by force in his States. In Brandenburg Lutheranism is similarly introduced by Joachim II., whose character is in striking contrast with that of his illustrious father, Joachim I.

1540. The Pope confirms the Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius of Loyola, who thus opposes a barrier against Protestantism. Religious Conferences at Spire, Haguenau and Worms. The Father of the Reformation allows polygamy to the Landgrave of Hesse.

1541. Religious Conference and *Interim* of Ratisbon. Julius Pflug, Bishop of Naumburg; and John Gropper, of Cologne; Melanchthon, Pistorius, and Bucer.

1542. St. Francis Xavier sets off upon his mission to India. Death of Cardinal Contareni. Death of Eck in 1543.

1545–1563. ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF TRENT, which, notwithstanding several interruptions, is continued under Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV. Its aim, practical reform, which it did much to accomplish.

1545. During the Diet of Worms, the Protestants once more refuse, in language unusually coarse and violent, to take any part in the proposed Council, and distribute to the Catholic deputies copies of Luther's work entitled "*The Papacy an Institution of the Devil.*"

1546. On the 18th of February, Luther dies at Eisleben. The Elector Herman of Cologne encounters the most determined opposition to his design of introducing Lutheranism in his States, and is at length deposed. Diet and Conference of Ratisbon.

1547. Commencement of the Schmalkaldic War. The imperial army makes the Elector of Saxony prisoner in the battle of Mühlberg, and the Landgrave of Hesse surrenders. Henry VIII. of England and Francis I. die, and are succeeded by Edward VI. and Henry II. The work of the Reformation is carried on in England by Cranmer and Ridley, and in Scotland by Knox. Death of Cardinal Sadolet and of Vatable.

1548. The Augsburg *Interim*. The Leipsig Interim gives rise to the adiaphoristic controversy. St. Philip Neri founds the Order of the B. Trinity, which, later on, takes the name of the Oratory. *Consensus Tigurinus*, 1549. Osiandrian controversy at Koenigsberg, 1549–1566. Controversy between Amsdorf and George Major in 1551. Gruet is put to death at Geneva. The Jesuits assume the direction of the theological studies at Ingolstadt in 1549. Labors of Peter Canisius in Austria in 1551.

1550–1555. Julius III., Pope. At the moment when several Protestant princes send their theologians and embassadors to Trent, in 1551, Prince

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

Maurice of Saxony, committing a double treason against the Emperor and his country, constrains the Council to disperse and the Emperor to conclude the Treaty of Passau, in 1552–1554. Assembly at Naumburg. Extraordinary concessions made by the Protestant theologians. Michael Servede is burnt by the Swiss Reformers in 1553, and a little later (1566) Gentilis is beheaded at Berne.

1555. Religious Peace of Augsburg: *Reservatum Ecclesiasticum.* Synergistic controversy between Pfeffinger and Amsdorf. Short pontificate of *Marcellus II.*

1555–1559. *Paul IV.*, Pope. Death of St. Ignatius Loyola, July 31, 1556. Thomas Cranmer is burnt at the stake. Lainez elected General of the Society of Jesus. Abdication of Charles V. Philip II., King of all the Spanish dominions in 1556. Mary Tudor, the Catholic Queen, dies in 1558. She is succeeded by Elizabeth, who uniformly favors the Reformation.

1559–1565. Pius IV., Pope. Ferdinand I., Emperor, 1556–1564. The Jesuits establish themselves at Cologne in 1556; at Treves in 1561; at Mentz in 1562; at Augsburg and Dillingen in 1563; at Posen and other places in 1571. Death of Melanchthon, April 19, 1560.

1562–1563. The Council of Trent is again opened, and completes its labors. In 1564, Pius IV. publishes the *Professio fidei Tridentina.* The year previous, Ursinus and Olivetanus published their Heidelberg Catechism. Convocation solemnly ratifies the Thirty-nine Articles at London in 1562. *Confessio Belgica*, 1562. *Corpus doctrinae christianae Saxonicum;* and later, *Philippicum*, 1560; *Prutenicum*, 1566.

1564–1576. Maximilian II., Emperor. *Pius V.*, Pope, 1566–1572. *Catechismus Romanus*, 1566; *Breviarium Romanum*, 1568. Attempts at reconciliation between the Catholics and Protestants, made by George Cassander, George Wizel, Fred. Staphylus, and Ad. Contzen. In 1567, Pius V. condemns seventy-six propositions extracted from the works of Baïus. Convention of the Polish Dissidents at Sandomir in 1570. Death of Calvin, May 27, 1564. Theodore Beza.

1572–1585. *Gregory XIII.*, Pope. St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572. Bull of Gregory XIII. against Baïus, 1579. The Gregorian Calendar published in 1582. Gebhard the Elector, Archbishop of Cologne, is excommunicated in 1583, in consequence of his criminal relations with Agnes of Mansfeld and his hostile designs against the Catholic Church. *Bellarmini disputationes de controversis christianae fidei articulis*, Romae, 1581–1592. Death of Maldonatus in 1583.

1577 Formula of Concord. The Socinian Catechism and Synod of Rakow, 1580. Faustus Socinus in Transylvania, 1578; in Poland, 1579.

1585–1590. *Sixtus V.*, Pope. He publishes a faulty edition of the Vulgate. *Martyrologium Romanum.* The Pope's decision in the Contro-

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

versy on Grace among the Jesuits. L. Molina. *Caesaris Baronii Annales* ecclesiastici. Death of Salmeron in 1585.

1590–1591. Urban VII., Gregory XIV., and Innocent IX., Popes. Death of the Elector, Christian I. New persecution of Crypto-Calvinism. Chancellor Crell.

1592. *Clement VIII.*, Pope. He publishes a thoroughly revised edition of the Vulgate, and reconciles Henry IV. of France to the Church, 1598. By the edict of Nantes, the Protestants obtain the free exercise of religion in all France. The *Congregatio de Auxiliis* meets to decide the question of Molinism. Sigismund III., King of Poland (1587–1632), inherits the crown of Sweden in 1592. His critical relations with Charles, Duke of Sudermanland. Death of Queen Elizabeth, 1603. James I. succeeds her. Controversy between Arminius and Gomar at Leyden, 1604.

1605–1621. *Paul V.*, Pope. The quarrel with Venice, commenced under Clement VIII. and Leo XI., continues during this pontificate. Venice is laid under interdict. Bellarmin and Sarpi continue their polemics. Controversy on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Catholic League formed in Germany under Maximilian of Bavaria, 1606. Peter de Berulle founds the French Oratory, 1611. Death of Esthius, 1613. Congregation of St. Maur, 1618. Cyril Lucaris makes an effort to bring about an understanding between the Greek and Reformed Churches. Synod of Dordrecht, 1618–1619.

1618–1648. Thirty Years' War. Frederic V., Elector of the Palatinate, is defeated near Prague, November 8, 1620. Death of Bellarmin, 1620. Death of St. Francis of Sales, 1622.

1621–1623. Gregory XV., Pope. Establishment of the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.* Constitution regarding future papal elections. The Jesuit, Petau, teaches theology at the College of Paris; he dies in 1652.

1623–1644. *Urban VIII.*, Pope. He establishes a seminary for the propagation of the faith ("*Collegium Urbanum*"); publishes a new and amended edition of the Roman Breviary, 1643; and bestows privileges upon the Congregation of St. Maur. St. Vincent de Paul founds the Order of the Priests of the Mission ("Lazarists") and Urban instructs him to draft a Rule for them. In conjunction with the widow Legras, he founds the Order of the Sisters of Charity in 1629. The "*Cautio Criminalis*" of the Jesuit, Spee, in 1631. Death of the Jesuit, Schall, in China, 1636. Victory of Tilly over the Danes and Lower Saxons, 1626, and of Wallenstein, 1628.

1629. *Restitution Edict* promulgated by the Emperor Ferdinand II., and re-establishment of the *status quo* as settled by the Treaty of Passau in 1552. Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, comes to Germany in 1630; his death at the battle of Lützen. Defeat of the

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

Swedes at Noerdlingen by the imperial troops in 1634. Death of Cornelius a Lapide in 1637.

1640. Publication of the *Augustinus* by Jansenius, at first Professor of Louvain, and afterward Bishop of Ypres. He dies in 1638. Urban issues against this work his bull *In Eminenti*, 1642. Hugo Grotius publishes his *Annotationes in Vet.* et *Nov. Testam.*, 1641. His death in 1645. Death of Bonfrère, 1643.

1644–1655. Innocent X., Pope. Ferdinand III., Emperor, 1637–1657. Louis XIV., King of France, 1643–1715. Petau publishes his *Theologica dogmata*, 1644. Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, and others write in favor of Jansenism and against the Jesuits. The advocates of Jansenism called Jansenists and Gentlemen of Port-Royal, 1653. Innocent condemns the five propositions of Jansenius, 1645. *Colloquium caritativum* of Thorn, under the protection of Ladislaus IV.; between *Calixtus* and *Calovius*, on one hand, and the Jesuit, Schoenhofer, on the other. The *Regula fidei* of Francis Véron, a work whose aim was to reconcile Catholics and Protestants. Paris Polyglot Bible, 1645.

1648. The Peace of Westphalia takes the year 1624 as the "*normal*" *year* of the religious situation and of the right of possession. The Pope, by his bull *Zelus domus Dei*, protests against the articles of the Treaty as injurious or prejudicial to the Catholic religion. Death of the Spaniard Calasanze, founder of the Piarists. Leo Allatius publishes his work, *De ecclesiae occident. et orient. perpetua consensione.* Death of Descartes, 1650. Charles I., King of England from 1625, is made prisoner, and beheaded in 1649.

SECOND EPOCH (1648–1878).

PART FIRST.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (1789).

1655–1667. *Alexander VII.*, Pope. His bull against the Jansenists, 1656. The Socinians expelled from Poland, 1658. Death of St. Vincent de Paul, 1660. Seminary of the Missions, founded at Paris, 1663. The Order of the Trappists, founded by Bouthillier de Rancé, 1662. Death of Abbess Arnauld of Port-Royal in 1661, and Peter de Marca, Archbishop of Paris, in 1662. Re-establishment of monarchy in England under Charles II., 1660. In the same year appear the *Critici sacri*, under the editorial management of Pearson. In 1668, Bossuet publishes his *Exposition of Catholic Doc-*

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

trine, demonstrating to many of the Reformers that they held wholly erroneous views on Catholicity. Translation of the *Bible of Mons* by Arnauld, the Duke of Luynes, Antoine Lemaistre, and de Sacy, 1667.

1670–1676. Clement X., Pope. Death of Cardinal Bona, 1674. Influence of Bossuet and Bourdaloue as preachers. Marshal Turénne becomes a Catholic, 1669. New Testament of Quesnel, 1671. Spener publishes his *Collegia pietatis*, from 1670, exposing the errors of the Protestant Church. In the same year the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* of Spinoza is published, 1675. *Formula consensus Helvetici.* Death of Paul Gerhard, 1676.

1676–1689. Innocent XI., Pope. His controversy with Louis XIV. on the right of *regalia*, 1682. Defense of the Four Articles by Bossuet. Death of Launoi, 1678. Hypercriticism of Richard Simon. The *Spiritual Guide* of Molinos gives rise to Quietism in 1675. Sixty-eight propositions extracted from it are condemned. The Barnabite, Lacombe, and Mme. Lamotte-Guyon. Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. James II., King of England. Christian Thomasius, compelled to leave Leipsig, withdraws to Halle in 1694, where he founds a university, in conjunction with Francke.

1683. Siege of Vienna by the Turks; forced by Sobieski to raise it. The Polish King dies in 1696.

1691–1700. Innocent XII., Pope. Controversy between Bossuet and Fénélon relative to the teachings of Mme. Guyon. The former composes his *States of Prayer;* the latter his *Maxims of the Saints*, 1697; twenty-three propositions of the latter censured in 1699. Noble victory of the Archbishop of Cambrai over himself. The French episcopacy and Louis XIV. disapprove the Four Articles in 1692. Attempt to reunite the various religious parties in Hanover through the mediation of Bossuet, van der Muelen, Spinola, and Leibnitz. Francke, preacher and professor at Halle, 1692.

1697. The Peace of Ryswick declares that in the German countries occupied by France the Catholic religion shall remain in *statu quo.* Frederic Augustus, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, returns to the Catholic Church.

1700–1721. *Clement XI.*, Pope. He protests (1701) against the assumption by Frederic I. of the title of King of Prussia, because that country had been formerly the property of the Church. Tournon, the Pope's Legate in India and China, 1707. Kodde, Vicar Apostolic and Administrator of the Diocese of Utrecht, is deposed as a Jansenist. Death of Rancé in 1700; of Bossuet and Bourdaloue in 1704. Destruction of the abbey of Port-Royal in 1708. One hundred and one propositions of the *New Testament* by Quesnel condemned by the bull *Unigenitus*, 1713. Malebranche, Fénélon, and Louis XIV. die in 1715. The regency is intrusted to the Duke of Orleans. Death of *du Pin* in 1719.

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1706–1709. Controversy between Pope Clement XI. and Emperor Joseph I., concerning the *right of presentation* and the Duchy of Parma. Charles VI., last Emperor of the House of Hapsburg, 1711–1740. Attempt in Berlin to reunite the Lutherans and the Reformed, 1703. Ursinus, Jablonski, and Leibnitz. Deism of the Englishmen, Collins and Tindal, preceded by the empiricism of Locke, who died in 1704. The Earl of Shaftesbury, head of a philanthropical school, dies in 1713.

1721–1723. Innocent XIII., Pope. His negotiations with Emperor Charles VI. He confirms, in France, the Order of the Brothers of Christian Doctrine. Death of the apologist, Huet, in 1721. The "Holy Synod," supreme and permanent, established by Peter I. in 1721. Hans Egede in Greenland. Zinzendorf and the Herrnhutters, from 1722.

1724–1730. Benedict XIII., Pope. He convokes Council of the Lateran in 1725, for the repression of abuses. His controversy with John V., King of Portugal. Institution of the office of *St. Gregory VII.* The Methodists, 1729.

1730–1740. *Clement XII.*, Pope. He is involved in fresh complications with Spain. He issues a bull against Freemasonry (1738). The Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer founded by St. Alfonso Maria da Liguori in 1732. The Lutherans emigrate from the Duchy of Salzburg from 1731 to 1733. The enemies of Christianity, Tindal, Woolston, and de Mandeville, die in 1733. Efforts in France to turn Christianity into ridicule. The Wertheim Bible, 1735. At Amsterdam, the Biblical critic and interpreter, Wetstein.

1740–1758. Important pontificate of Benedict XIV. His splendid work, *De synodo dioecesana.* Maria-Teresa, 1740–1780. The learned Muratori, closely connected with the Pope by ties of friendship. Houbigant publishes his critical edition of the Old Testament in 1753. Christianity continues to be attacked by the Atheists and enemies of the Jesuits, Voltaire, d'Alembert, Diderot, the political economists, and J. J. Rousseau. Death of Bengel at Stuttgart, 1742. Baron Wolf and Wetstein die in 1754. Death of the learned Mosheim at Goettingen in 1755, and of Baumgarten at Halle in 1757.

1758–1769. *Clement XIII.*, Pope. He is harassed on all sides with complaints and accusations against the Jesuits. His bull *Apostolicum*, in their favor, produces no effect. In Portugal, Pombal's influence brings about their suppression, 1759. They are persecuted and suppressed in France in 1764; in Spain in 1767; and in Naples in 1768. Death of Assemani in 1768. In Germany, French Gallicanism is transformed into Febronianism (Hontheim), 1763. Ernesti, Semler, and Teller in 1767. Reimarus in 1768. Controversy on the legality of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church, 1766.

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1769–1774. Clement XIV., Pope. Joseph II., Emperor from 1766 to 1790, is restrained within the limits of decency during the lifetime of Maria Teresa, who dies in 1780. The Bishop of Hildesheim is appointed Vicar Apostolic of the North. The Pope's brief, *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, sacrifices the Jesuits to the Bourbon Courts. The *System of Nature*, published in 1770, aims at annihilating religion and morality. Death of Swedenborg at London in 1772.

1775–1799. Pius VI., Pope. From 1780, Joseph II. becomes the leader of the enemies of the Catholic Church; favors the Gallican doctrines of the canonists, Eybel and Ries, as well as Illuminism and Freemasonry; and establishes "General Seminaries." The presence of Pius VI. at Vienna changes but very little the state of affairs. *Punctuation* of Ems. Synod of Pistoia in Tuscany, owing to the protection of the Grand Duke Leopold, brother to the Emperor Scipio Ricci, in 1786. The *Illuminati* in Bavaria. In France, irreligion and war against Catholicity. Warnings and sinister predictions of the clergy, 1780. The interpreter, Eichhorn, lectures at Goettingen from 1788, and propagates Naturalism. Death of Ernesti and Lessing in 1781; of Francis Walch in 1784; of the popular philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, in 1785; of Michaelis and Semler in 1791. Kant's influence on theology. Frederic William, King of Prussia. Edict concerning religion issued by Minister Woellner in 1788. Spread of pure Rationalism.

PART SECOND.

FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DOWN TO THE PRESENT DAY (1789–1878).

1789. Outbreak of the French Revolution. Joseph II. dies in despondency in 1790. He is succeeded by his brother, Leopold II. (1790–1792), who is in turn succeeded by his son, Francis II. The latter, led by the true spirit of the Holy Christian Empire, declares himself, at a critical moment, the protector of the Roman Church and of the Pope. In America, the See of Baltimore is established.

1789–1791. The Constituent National Assembly of France declares all ecclesiastical possession national property (1789), and establishes a civil constitution for the clergy (1791), forcing them to take a purely civil oath. Reduction of the number of bishoprics.

1791–1795. The Legislative Assembly and the National Convention consummate this impious work. Louis XVI. dies on the scaffold, January 21, 1793. Every vestige of Christianity disappears; the Christian calendar is replaced by the unmeaning Grecian decade;

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

and the Christian worship by the orgies in honor of the Goddess of Reason, November 7, 1793. Robespierre decrees the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, July 8, 1794. Pius VI. protests against all these acts; is made prisoner by the French, and Rome is proclaimed a republic. Death of Pius VI. at Valence, on the 29th of August, 1799. Bonaparte First Consul. Griesbach publishes his edition of the New Testament, 1796–1806.

1800–1823. Pius VII. elected Pope at Venice. Concordat with France, 1801. Influence of Châteaubriand. He publishes his *Genius of Christianity* in 1802. In Germany, Count Frederic Leopold of Stolberg sets the example of a return to Catholicity. It is followed by a great number of conversions. In Great Britain and America great associations for Protestant foreign missions are founded, whilst similar societies are formed on the European continent, and missionary training schools are established at Berlin (1806, by Jänicke) and other places.

1801–1803. Resolution of the deputies of the Empire concerning the Treaty of Lunéville of 1801. Charles Theodore of Dalberg, last Elector and Archbishop of Mentz, 1802. Secularization of almost all ecclesiastical princedoms in Germany.

1804. The Jesuits restored in Naples. Pius VII. anoints Bonaparte Emperor, and is shortly at variance with him.

1806. Dissolution of the German Empire. The Confederation of the Rhine placed under the protection of the Emperor of the French. The States of the Church incorporated into the French Empire, 1809. The Pope carried away to Savona.

1808. The See of Baltimore is raised to metropolitan rank.

1811–1813. The National Council held at Paris completely disappoints the expectations of the Emperor, who wished to regulate the affairs of the Church without the concurrence of the Pope. Preliminary articles of a new Concordat.

1814. After Napoleon's abdication, Pius VII. returns to Rome, and by the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* re-establishes the Society of Jesus. Soon after Napoleon's return from Elba and the invasion of the Papal States by the troops of Murat, the Pope is obliged to again withdraw from Rome. Napoleon, defeated at Waterloo, is transported for life to St. Helena. The Pope applies to the English to obtain from them some mitigation of the hard lot of his former persecutor. The Holy Alliance of 1815. Conclusion of several Concordats with Catholic and non-Catholic princes of Germany, 1817–1829.

1817–1818. The Irish Catholic Emancipation Bill once more rejected by the English Parliament in 1817. Louis XVIII. renews with the Pope (1817) the Concordat of Leo X. and Francis I., which, however, is not executed. Establishment of the Jesuit College at Fribourg in Switzerland. The jubilee of the Reformation celebrated in

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

1817. While irritating to Catholics, it laid bare the internal discrepancies of Protestants and their entire relinquishment of the Lutheran symbol. Violent quarrel occasioned by the theses of Nicholas Harms. Missionary societies and training institutes founded at Basle in 1815 and 1816, and at Berne in 1824.

1823–1829. *Leo XII.*, Pope. Concordats concluded by him.

1826. In England, the entire episcopacy publishes a declaration, asking for a repeal of the penal laws against Catholics.

1829–1830. *Pius VIII.*, Pope. He is consoled for the revolutionary movements in Italy by the conquest of Algiers in 1830, and still more by the religious emancipation of the Irish on the 13th of April, 1829. Revolution of July, by which the elder branch of the Bourbons is dethroned, and the Duke of Orleans called to the throne. The St. Simonians. The Evangelical Union of Prussia in 1830 occasions divers Lutheran movements.

1831. Gregory XVI., Pope (February 2). He displays great energy under adverse circumstances. Death of Hegel and Hermes.

1832. Moehler's Symbolism appears and makes a deep impression all over Germany. Moehler dies on the 12th of April, 1838.

1837. November 20, the "Catastrophe of Cologne," simultaneous with a similar movement at Posen. The Russian institution of the Holy and Permanent Synod is transplanted into Greece, with the approval of the bishops (August 4, 1833), and the patriarch of Constantinople recognizes the independence of the Orthodox Church in Hellas.

1840. Return of the Archbishop of Posen to his diocese (†December 25, 1842).

1842. Amicable settlement of the Cologne differences. This event causes a very decided reaction in favor of the Catholic Church throughout Germany. Success of missionary efforts. Protestantism more than ever rent by internal dissensions. A great many writers exert themselves to set aside the Gospel and have it replaced by modern philosophy. These attempts give rise to others of a directly opposite character. The General Synod of Berlin in 1846 re-establishes several religious feasts.

1846. Erection of Oregon city into an archiepiscopal see. Death of Gregory XVI. and accession of Pius IX. His political reforms. The energy displayed by this Pope in the ecclesiastical affairs of every country excites general admiration.

1847. Establishment of the Archbishopric of St. Louis.

1848. The general enfranchisement acquired by the people turns to the advantage of the Church, both in Catholic and Protestant countries. Liberty of the press and right of association. Establishment of the *Pius Verein.* Its first general assembly, composed of laymen and ecclesiastics, is held at Mentz from the 3d to the 5th day of October. The German archbishops and bishops meet at Würzburg from the 22d of October to the 16th of November.

Hosted by Google

DIONYSIAN ERA.

The French prelates at Paris in 1849. Meeting in other ecclesiastical provinces. Restoration of synods.

1850–1860. The Catholic hierarchy re established in England, and New York, Cincinnati, and New Orleans created archbishoprics in 1850, and San Francisco in 1853. Concordats entered into by Pius IX. with Russia in 1847; with Tuscany and Spain in 1851; with Costarica and Guatemala in 1852; with Austria in 1855; with Würtemberg in 1857; with the Grand Duchy of Baden in 1859; and with Nicaragua and San Salvador in 1861. Solemn proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, December, 1854.

1860–1872. Cialdini's soldiers massacre the insignificant pontifical army near Castel-Fidardo, September 18, 1860. The States of the Church are reduced to the "Patrimony" of St. Peter. Treaty of September 15, 1864, between France and Piedmont. Eighteenth centenary of SS. Peter and Paul, 1867. New revolutionary attempts on Rome. Intervention of France, 1867. Vatican Council, 1869–1870. Franco-German war, 1870. Rome taken by the Piedmontese army, September 20, 1870. Protest of Pius IX., September, 1870. Persecution of the Church in Italy, Switzerland, and Germany, 1872 sq. Revival of the Catholic spirit in France after the war and in countries where the Church is persecuted.

1873. May laws enacted in Germany against the free exercise of Catholic worship. Expulsion of Religious Orders from Germany and other States. Confiscation of Church property in Italy. Exile of Catholic bishops from Germany and Switzerland.

1874. Foundation of a Catholic University in England. Continued persecution of the Church in Germany, Russia, and Switzerland. Incipient persecution in Austria. General persecution of the Catholic press in the European countries. Erection of the province of Melbourne.

1875. Appointment of the first American cardinal. Erection of the ecclesiastical provinces of Philadelphia, Boston, Milwaukee, and Santa Fé. Revival of Catholic spirit in Italy, owing to the second Catholic Congress. Progress of higher education in the Catholic Universities of France.

1876. Eastern question in Europe. Massacre of Christians in Bulgaria. Servian revolt. Continued interference of the State in matters of religion.

1877. War between Russia and Turkey. June 3, Golden jubilee of the Episcopate of Pius IX. Establishment of numerons Catholic universities in France amidst threatening prospects for the Catholic Church. Catholic congresses of Bergamo and Würzburg.

1878. Death of Victor Emmanuel, Pius IX., Padre Secchi, and Dr. Alzog. Election of Leo XIII. Catholic hierarchy re-established in Scotland.

Hosted by Google

III. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF THE COUNCILS HELD DURING THE THIRD PERIOD.

IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Paris, 1521. Rouen, 1522. Paris, 1528. Bourges, 1528. Montpellier, 1528. Cologne, 1536. *Trent* (*Nineteenth Ecumenical*), 1545–1563. Cologne, 1549. Poissy, 1554 (Assembly). Rheims, 1564. Toledo, 1565. Milan, 1565. Cambray, 1565. Milan, 1569. Malines, 1569. Milan, 1573, 1576, 1579. Rouen, 1581. Milan, 1582 (being the sixth provincial council held by St. Charles Borromeo, beside eleven diocesan synods). Memphis, 1582. Rheims, 1583. Tours, 1583. Angers, 1583. Bordeaux, 1583. Bourges, 1583. Lima (in South America), 1583. Aix (in Provence), 1585. Mexico, 1585. Toulouse, 1590. Avignon, 1594. Aquileia, 1596.

IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

The ordinance of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV. de Reform., c. 2), that *provincial councils* should be held every three years and *diocesan synods* every year, was even more generally carried out. Of those numerous provincial councils, the following deserve special mention, viz: Petrikau, 1607. Paris, 1612. Florence, 1619, 1637, 1645, 1681, and 1691. Lucca, 1661 and 1681. Velletri, 1673. Naples, 1680. Malines, 1607. Narbonne, 1609. Bordeaux, 1624. Tyrnau, 1630. Constantinople, 1638, 1642, and 1672 (against Calvinist errors). At Lima, 1601, 1602, and 1603.

IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Paris, 1713, 1714, and 1720. Lateran, 1725. Of Mount Lebanon, 1736. False Council of Pistoia, 1785, and the so-called National Council of Florence, 1787; the Congress at Ems of the Rhenish Electors, held in 1786, and the Assembly of the "Constitutional" bishops, at Paris in 1797; and, moreover, that of *Antioch* in 1806, convoked by Germanus Adami, Abp. of Hierapolis and Visitor Apostolic, the friend of Scipio Ricci, follows in the same drift. On the other hand, the *Assemblée du Clergé* of 1789 declares against the prevailing irreligiousness and immorality. After these sorry attempts to emulate the greater councils, even the *diocesan synods* disappear in all countries of Europe, *Italy excepted. John Carroll*, Bishop of Baltimore, was the first to give the signal of their revival beyond the Atlantic in 1791.

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Synod of the "Constitutional Bishops" at Paris, 1802. So-called National Council of Paris, 1811. National Council of Hungary, 1822. Beginning of

Hosted by Google

regular *Provincial Councils* at Baltimore, from 1829. In Italy, France, Great Britain, etc., from 1848. At *Rome*, 1854, *Conventus Episcoporum* for the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary; 1862, for the canonization of the Japanese Martyrs; 1867, for the Eighteenth Centenary of the Martyrdom of the Princes of the Apostles. In Germany and Austria, assemblies of bishops at Würzburg, Cologne, and Vienna (1848 and 1849); afterward, the Provincial Councils of *Gran*, 1857; *Vienna*, 1858; Venice, 1859; Prague and Cologne, 1860; Calocza, 1863. *Vatican*, 1869, 1870 (*Twentieth Ecumenical*).

Hosted by Google

MODERN COUNCILS HELD FROM 1682-1869.

Chronologically arranged by the Translator (according to the Collectio Lacensis, Freiburg, 1870–1876).

COUNCIL.	QUALITY.	TIME.	PRESIDENT.	MEMBERS.				EXEMPT.
				APBS.	CARDS.	BPS.	ABBOTS, ETC.	
1st of the Maronites, at Antioch.	Provincial (of the Rite).	18 Sept., 1596.	Sergius, Patriarch Ant.	3	.....	.....	2 Deac., many Pr'sts	.....
2d of the Maronites, at Antioch.	Provincial (of the Rite).	3 Nov., 1596.	Joseph Peter, P. A.	.....	Not	given.	.....	.....
†Paris	Called National	1681, 1682.	Francis, Abp. Paris	7	.....	26	36	.....
Tyrnau (Hungary)	National	24 Oct., 1682.	(Litt. Abp.) G. Szelepchény, Apb. Gran	.....	Not	known.	.....	.....
Tarragona	1st Provincial	1685.	Jos. Sanchez, Abp. Tarragona.	.....	.....	6	31	.....
Benevento	1st Provincial	11,13 16 Apl., 1693	Vinc. Maria Card. Orsini, Abp. Benev.	.....	.....	13	3	.....
Benevento	2d Provincial	10,14,19 May, 1698	Vinc. Maria Card. Orsini, Abp. Benev.	.....	.....	14	2	9 Bishops.
Naples	1st Provincial	1699	James, Card. Cantelmus, Abp. Neap.	.....	.....	4	.....	1 Bishop.
Tarragona	2d Provincial	1699.	J seph Llinas, Abp. Tarr.	.....	Not	known.	.....	.....
Albania, at Merchigna	National	1703.	Vincent Zmajewick, Abp. Antibar.	.....	1	4	.....	.....
Tarragona, at Barcelona	3d Provincial	1712.	Fran. Dorda, Ep. Callson (Ap. mortuo)	.....	.....	.....	Not known.	.....
Tarragona, at Gerona	4th Provincial	1717.	D. M. Joann. de Taverner, Bp. Gerona.	.....	.....	.....	Not known.	.....
Ruthenians, at Szamos Ujvar.	Provincial.	1720.	Jerome, Abp. of Edessa.	.....	4	5	8 Archimandrites.	.....
Tarragona	5th Provincial	1722.	Emmanuel de Samaniego, Abp.	.....	.....	.....	Not known.	.....
Rome	Provincial.	1725.	Benedict XIII.	5	32	39	3	About 50 Procuratores...
Avignon	Provincial.	1725.	F. M. de Gonteriis, Abp.	.....	.....	3	.....	.....
Fermo	Provincial.	1726.	Alexander Borgia, Abp.	.....	.....	4	.....	.....
Embrun (Ebrodunens.)	Provincial.	1727.	Peter de Guérin, Abp.	.....	.....	14	.....	.....
Tarragona	6th Provincial	1727.	Emmanuel de Samaniego, Abp.	.....	Not	known.	Not known.	.....
Tarragona	7th Provincial	1733.	Peter Copons, Abp.	.....	Not	known.	Not known.	.....
3d of the Maronites (the most celebrated), in the Lebanon	For the whole Rite.	1736.	Jos. Peter Gazenus, Patr. of Antioch.	.....	.....	62	.....	About 50
Tarragona	8th Provincial	1738.	Peter Copons, Abp.	.....	Not	known	.....	.....
Tarragona	9th Provincial	1752.	Peter Copons, Abp.	.....	Not	known.	.....	.....
Baltimore	Diocesan (for all the U.S. of N. A.)	1791.	John Carroll, Bp.	.....	.....	.....	22 Priests.	.....
4th of the Maronites*	Provincial.	1806.	Not known.	.....	Not	known.	.....	.....
Baltimore	Informal Synod	1810.	John Carroll, Abp.	.....	.....	5	.....	.....
Paris	National	11 June, 1811.	Jos. Fesch, Card. (Napol.).	12	5	87	.....	.....
Of the Melchites (Mt. Lebanon).	Patriarchal	1812.	Not given	.....	Not	given.	.....	.....
Tuam	1st Provincial	6, 7, 8 May, 1817.	Oliver Kelley, Abp.	.....	.....	6	.....	.....

*Not approved by the Holy See.

Hosted by Google

5th of the Maronites	National	1818	John Dolce, Patr.					
Baltimore	1st Provincial	4 Oct., 1829	James Whitfield, Abp.			5	1 Administrator.	
Baltimore	2d Provincial	20 Oct., 1833	James Whitfield, Abp.			9		
Of the Melchites (Ain-Traz)	Patriarchal	1835	Maximus Mazlum, Patr.		Not given.			
Baltimore	3d Provincial	16 April, 1837	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.			9		
Baltimore	4th Provincial	17 May, 1840	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.			12		
Baltimore	5th Provincial	14 May, 1843	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.			15	1 Vicar General.	
Sydney (Australia)	1st Provincial	10 Sept., 1844	John Bede Polding, Abp. Syd.			2		
Baltimore	6th Provincial	10 May, 1846	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.			22		
Oregon	Provincial	28 Feb., 1848	Francis Norbert Blanchet, Abp.			2	1 Presbyter.	
Paris	Informal Synod	28 Feb., 1849	Maria D. A. Sibour, Abp.			12		
Baltimore	7th Provincial	6 May, 1849	Samuel Eccleston, Abp.		1	23		
Paris	Provincial	17 Sept., 1849	Maria D. A. Sibour, Abp.			4		
Soissons (Prov. Rheims)	1st Provincial	1 Oct., 1849	Thomas M. J., Card. Gousset, Abp.			3	1 Procurator.	
Tours	Provincial	11 Nov., 1849	Francis N. M. Morlot, Abp.			7		
Avignon	Provincial	8 Dec., 1849	John M. D. Balay, Abp.			4		
Alby	Provincial	23 June, 1850	John J. M. A. de Jerphanion, Abp.			3		
Lyons	Provincial	30 June, 1850	Louis, J. M., Card. de Bonald, Abp.			3	1 Procurator.	
Rouen	Provincial	8 July, 1850	Louis M. E. Blanquart de Bailleul, Abp.			4		
2d Thurles (Ireland)	Plenary	22 Aug., 1850	Paul Cullen, Abp. Armagh		3	20	3 Procurat., 1 Abbot	
1st Bordeaux	1st Provincial	14 July, 1850	Ferdinand, F. A., Card. Bonnet, Abp.			8	1 Procurator.	
Sens	Provincial	2 Sept., 1850	Mellon Jolly, Abp.			3		
Aix	Provincial	8 Sept., 1850	Peter M. J. Darcimoles, Abp.			6		
Toulouse	Provincial	10 Sept., 1850	Paul Th. D. d'Astros, Abp.			3	1 Coadjutor Arch.	
Bourges, at Clermont	Provincial	6 Oct., 1850	Jas. M. A. Celestin, Card. du Pont, Abp.			4		
Quebec	1st Provincial	15 Aug., 1851	Peter Fl. Turgeon, Abp.			7		
Auch	Provincial	20 Aug., 1851	Nic. Aug. de la Croix d'Azolette			3		
Baltimore	1st Plenary	9 May, 1852	Francis Patrick Kenrick, Abp. Balt.			26		
Westminster	1st Provincial	7 July, 1852	Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Abp.		5	10	2 Procuratores.	
Amiens (Prov. Rheims)	2d Provincial	10 Jan., 1853	Dose, M. J. Card. Gousset, Abp.			3	1 Procurator.	
Dublin	Provincial	2 June, 1853	Paul Cullen, Abp.			3		
Bordeaux (La Rochelle)	2d Provincial	23 July, 1853	Ferd. Card. Bonnet, Abp.			7	1 Procurator.	3 Ex-Bishops.
Cashel	Provincial	1 Sept., 1853	Michael Slattery, Abp.			8	1 Abbot.	
Armagh	Provincial	10 May, 1854	Joseph Dixon, Abp.			7	1 Procurator.	
Dublin	*Comentes*	19 May, 1851	Paul Card. Cullen, Abp.		Not given.		All Bps. of Ireland represented.	
Quebec	2d Provincial	28 May, 1854	Peter Fl. Turgeon, Abp.			8		
Port of Spain	Provincial	22 June, 1854	Josch. Louis Gonin, Abp.		3 Vi. Ap.			
Tuam	2d Provincial	15 Aug., 1854	John McHale, Abp.			4	2 Procurators.	
New York	Provincial	1 Oct., 1854	John Hughes, Abp.			7		
Baltimore	8th Provincial	6 May, 1854	F. P. Kenrick, Abp.			5	2 Administrators.	
Cincinnati	1st Provincial	13 May, 1855	J. B. Purcell, Abp.			6		
Westminster	2d Provincial	11 July, 1855	Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Abp.			10	3 Vicarii Cap., 1 Ab.	2
St. Louis	1st Provincial	7 Oct., 1855	Peter Ken. Kenrick, Abp.			5		
New Orleans	1st Provincial	20 Jan., 1856	Anthony Blanc, Abp.			4		
Bordeaux (Périgueux)	3d Provincial	2 Aug., 1856	Ferdinand F. A. Card. Donnet, Abp.			6	3 Procuratores.	
Halifax	Provincial	8 Sept., 1857	William Walsh, Abp.			3		
Rheims	3d Provincial	18 Nov., 1857	Thos. Card. Gousset, Abp.			4		

Hosted by Google

MODERN COUNCILS—*Continued.*

COUNCIL.	QUALITY.	TIME.	PRESIDENT.	MEMBERS.				EXEMPT.
				ABPS.	CARDS.	BPS.	ABBOTS, ETC.	
Baltimore	9th Provincial	2 May, 1858	Francis P. Kenrick, Abp.			7	Several Superiors of Orders *sine voto.*	
Cincinnati	2d Provincial	2 May, 1858	John B. Purcell, Abp			6		
Tuam	3d Provincial	10 Aug., 1858	John McHale, Abp			6	1 Coadjutor.	
St. Louis	2d Provincial	5 Sept., 1858	Peter R. Kenrick, Abp			7	1 Administrator.	
Westminster	3d Provincial	13 July, 1859	Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Abp			11	1 Coadjutor.	
Bordeaux (Agen.)	4th Provincial	8 Sept., 1859	Ferdinand F. A. Card. Donnet, Abp.			7	2 Procuratores.	
New York†	2d Provincial	19 Jan., 1860	John Hughes, Abp			7	1 Procurator.	
New Orleans	2d Provincial	22 Jan., 1860	Anthony Blanc, Abp			5		
Baltimore‡	Informal Synod	22 Jan., 1860						
Cincinnati	3d Provincial	29 April, 1861	John B. Purcell, Abp			7		
New York	3d Provincial	2 June, 1861	John Hughes, Abp			7		
Quebec	3d Provincial	14 May, 1863	Chas. Fr. Baillargon, Administrator.			7		
Armenian (Bzommar)	For the whole Rite	15 Sept., 1866	Melchior Nazarian, Patriarch		7			
Baltimore	2d Plenary	7 Oct., 1866	Martin John Spalding, Abp. Balt		6	36	1 Aux., 1 Adm'r., 1 Procurator, 2 Abb's	
Port of Spain	2d Provincial	13 Jan., 1867	Joachim Louis Gonin, Abp			3		
Bordeaux (Poitiers)	5th Provincial	12 Jan., 1868	Ferd. Fr. A. Card. Donnet, Abp			5	1 Vic. Capit., 2 Procuratores.	
Quebec	4th Provincial	7 May, 1868	Chas. Fr. Baillargon, Abp			8	2 Procuratores.	
Sydney (Australia)	Informal Synod	7 Aug., 1868	John Beda Polding, Abp			5		
Melbourne (Australia)	2d Provincial	18 April, 1869	John Beda Polding, Abp. Sidney			7		
Baltimore	10th Provincial	25 April, 1869	Martin John Spalding, Abp			11	1 Abbot.	1

† This Council issued no decrees.

‡ The Synod published a circular letter.

Hosted by Google

GENERAL INDEX.

THE ROMAN FIGURE INDICATES THE VOLUME, THE ARABIC FIGURE THE PAGE.

A.

Abbacomites, II. 162, 360.
Abbates legitimi, II. 162.
Abasgi, I. 502.
Abdas, Bp. of Susa, I. 500.
Abelard, II. 747, 750, 1034.
Abo, See of, II. 231.
Abo of Fleury, II. 309.
Abraham a Sancta Clara, III. 555.
Abraxas, I. 313.
Absalom, Bp. of Röskilde, II. 802.
Abyssinia, I. 504, III. 933.
Acacius, Patr. of Constantinople, I. 613.
Acacius, Bp. of Amida, I. 500.
Acacius, Bp. of Berea, I. 601.
Acacius, Bp. of Melitene, I. 603.
Academy of the Cath. Religion, III. 685.
Academicians, I. 91.
Acephali, I. 614.
Acolyths, I. 393.
Acta facientes, I. 275.
Acta Martyrum, I. 23.
Acta Sanctorum Bollandi, I. 23.
Adalbero, Bp. of Würzburg, II. 495.
Adalbert the Frank, heretic, II. 174.
Adalbert, Archbp. of Bremen, II. 235.
Adalbert, Archbp. of Magdeburg, II. 371.
Adalbert, Bp. of Prague, II. 244, 248, 251, 309.
Adalbert, Bp. of Wollin, II. 802.
Adam of Bremen, I. 41.
Adamnan, II. 94.
Adelphius and the Adelphians, I. 758.
Adiaphoristic (controversy), III. 137.
Administrators, I., 650, II. 131.
Adoptionism, II. 176.
Adoration of the Eucharist, I. 718.
Advent, I. 702.
Advocati, togati et armati, II. 131.
Advocatia ecclesiae, II. 131.
Aëdisius, I. 504.
Aegidius (Giles), of Viterbo, II. 918, 1018.
Aegidius of Colonna, II. 624, note 1.
Aelurus, priest, I. 612.
Aeneas Sylvius, II. 890, 894.
Aërius, priest of Sebaste, I. 759.
Aëtius, deacon of Antioch, I. 540.
Afra, I. 282.
Africa (Propagation of Christianity in). See *Propagation of Christianity*.
Agapae, I. 211, 439; they are forbidden, 439, 724.
Agapete I. Pope, I. 618.
Agapete II., Pope, II. 296.
Agatho, Pope, I. 640.
Agenda (controversy on the), III. 985.
Ἁγιασμός (φωτισμός), I. 419.
Agnes, Empress, II. 324.
Agnes, Martyr, I. 282.
Agnoëtians, I. 616.
Agobard of Lyons, II. 413.
Agonistics, I. 515.
Agricola (John), III. 136, 315.
Agrippinus, Bp. of Carthage, I. 240.
Aidan, Bishop, II. 74.
Aix-la-Chapelle (Councils of), II. 161, 181, 277.
Aizana, I. 504.
Alanus of Ryssel, or ab Insulis, II. 757, 1035.
Alaric, II. 24.
Albanians, I. 502.
Albert the Great, II. 767, 798.
Albert of Brandenburg, Archbp. of Mentz, III. 11.
Albert, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, III. 156.
Albigenses (the), II. 661.
Alboin, II. 122.
Alboin the Saxon, II. 122.
Alcuin, II. 172, 180, 379.
Alemannian law, II. 100.
Alessandria, II. 562.
Alexander, Patr. of Alexandria, I. 520.
Alexander, Bp. of Flaviades, and later on Patr. of Jerusalem, I. 275, 376.
Alexander of Hales, II. 720, 766, 798.

Hosted by Google

Alexander of Hierapolis, I. 602.
Alexander Severus, I. 270.
Alexander I., Pope, I. 413.
Alexander II., Pope, II. 330.
Alexander III., Pope, II. 231, 559, 644, 665.
Alexander IV., Pope, II. 598.
Alexander V., Pope, II. 856.
Alexander VI., Pope, II. 907.
Alexander VII., Pope, III. 479.
Alexander VIII., Pope, III. 484.
Alexandria (Councils of), I. 522, 545, 596.
Alexandria, Neo-platonist School of, 291–492.
Alexandrian School, I. 374, 564, 653.
Alexian (the Brothers), II. 725.
Alfred the Great, II. 266, 380, 413.
Algiers, III. 933.
Allah Taala, II. 192, note 1.
Allegorical interpretation of the Gnostics, I. 309; of Origen, I. 380.
Allegri, III. 436.
Alliance (the Holy), III. 682.
All-saints. Feast of, II. 397.
All-souls-day, II. 397.
Alogi, I. 349.
Alphonso IX., King of Leon, II. 577.
Altar, I. 449, plurality of altars, I. 690.
Altman, Bp. of Passau, II. 373.
Alvarus Pelagius, II. 832.
Amalarius of Metz, II. 431.
Amalarius of Treves, II. 173.
Amalric of Bena, II. 584.
Amandus, Bp. of Strasburg, II. 108.
Ambrosian (Ecclesiastical Chant), I. 696.
Ambrosian Hymn, I. 695.
Ambrose (St.), Bp. of Milan, I. 494, 549, 564, 695, 728, 757, II. 41.
America (Introduction and Spread of Christianity in). See *Propagation of Christianity.*
Ammianus Marcellinus, I. 462, 544, 659.
Ammonius (the Monk), I. 752.
Ammonius Saccas (the philosopher), I. 291.
Amphilochius, Bp. of Iconium, I. 546.
Amsdorf, III. 114, 121.
Anabaptists, III. 57, 94, 285.
Anabaptists of Münster, III. 116.
Analogia fidei, III. 310.
Anastasius I., Pope I. 557.
Anastasius II., Pope, II. 48.
Anastasius I., Emperor, I. 614.
Anastasius II., Emperor, I. 643.
Anastasius, Roman Librarian, I. 40.
Anastasius of Thessalonica, I. 676.
Anatolius, Patr. of Const., I. 607.
Anchorites, I. 453, 748.
Ancient documents, I. 27, note 2.
Ancyra (Synod of), I. 540.
Anderson (Lawrence), III. 177.
Andreae, Valentine, Chancellor, III. 314.
Andrew, Apostle, I. 184.
Andrew of Pisa, II. 1049.
Angelomus, Monk of Luxeuil, II. 415.
Angelus Silesius, III. 434.
Anglo-Saxons, II. 51, 378.
Anglican Church, III. 203.
Anicetus, Pope, I. 445.
Anlam, III. 928.
Anniversary, I. 454.
Annunciation (Feast of the), I. 703.
Anomoeians, I. 539.
Anselm of Canterbury, II. 524, 740.
Anselm of Laon, II. 784.
Ansgar (St.), II. 225.
Anthemius, I. 489.
Anthimus, Bp. of Trebisond, I. 618.
Anthropomorphists, I. 557.
Antididagma of the Metropolitan Chapter of Cologne, III. 123.
Antinomistical (Controversy), III. 315.
Antioch (Christian Community of), I. 175, 237.
Antioch (School of), I. 387, 564, 591, 653.
Antioch (Arian Symbols of), I. 539.
Antioch (Councils of), I. 351, 367, 535.
Anthony (St.), the Hermit, I. 453, 749.
Anthony of Padua, II. 721.
Anthonists, or Hospitalers, II. 697.
Antitrinitarians, I. 348, III. 334.
Antonius Pius, I. 265.
Antoninus (St.), Archbp. of Florence, I. 42, II. 1051.
Apelles, I. 332.
Apocryphal books on the Life of Jesus, I. 163, and the Apostles, I. 234.
Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Apologist, I. 294.
Apollinaris (father and son) of Laodicea, I. 562, 695.
Apollinaris of Ravenna, I. 241.
Apollinarists, I. 562.
Apollonius of Tyana, I. 98.
Apologists, Christian, I. 293, 491, II. 205.
Apostles, I. 154; their labors, I. 166.
Apostolic Brethren, II. 675.
Apostolic Canons and Constitutions, I. 234.
Apostolic Fathers, I. 232.
Apostolic Age, I. 233.

Hosted by Google

Appellants, III. 506, 508.
Appeal from the Church to the State, first instance of, I. 514.
Appeals to the Pope, I. 671, II. 633.
Appeals from the Pope to a General Council, II. 627; forbidden, II. 871.
Applause in Church, I. 712.
Aquarians, I. 329.
Aquila, I. 176.
Aquileja (Synod), I. 631.
Arabia (Christianity in), I. 238, 502.
Arausio (Orange), Synod, I. 588.
Arcadius, I. 487.
Archbishop, I. 663.
Archdeacons, I. 392, 651, II. 352, 647; sometimes laymen, II. 137.
Archdiaconate and archpresbyterate, II. 137.
Archpriests, I. 651, II. 352.
Architecture, Gothic or Germanic, II. 1040.
Archivists, I. 651.
Arethas, Bp. of Caesarea, II. 466.
Ariald, II. 376.
Arianism, I. 521.
Arianism, gradual extinction of, I. 544.
Aristides, Apologist, I. 294.
Aristotle, I. 89, and especially, II. 734, 743, 765.
Arius, I. 519, 529.
Arles (Councils of), I. 424, 446, 514, 538, II. 161.
Armagh (See of), II. 55.
Armenia, Christian, I. 501, 632, II. 945.
Arminius, and the Arminians, III. 326.
Armistice (Canonical). See *Truce of God.*
Arnaud, I. 46, III. 416, 501.
Arnaud Angelica, III. 502.
Arndt (True Christianity by), III. 312.
Arnobius, Apologist, I. 297.
Arnold (Ch. Historian), I. 55.
Arnold of Brescia, II. 541, 669.
Arnold of Citeaux, II. 666.
Arras (See of), II. 108.
Art (religious), I. 448, 691, II. 1038.
Artemon, Antitrinitarian, I. 350.
Articles (the Thirty-nine) of the Anglican Church, III. 211.
Ascension of Our Lord (feast of the), I. 446, 699.
Ascetics, I. 452.
Ascetical (life), I. 452.
Asbebetus, Bp., I. 503.
Askidas, Bp. of Caesarea, I. 621.
Assemani, I. 49, III. 535.
Asses (feast of), II. 794.
Assumption (feast of the). See *Festum Assumptionis B. M. V.*
Asylum, ecclesiastical, I. 648.
Asylums, for the poor, orphans, sick, II. 641.
Ataulf or Aistolphus, II. 25.
Aterbius, I. 555.
Athanasius (St.), I. 494, 527, 601, 647, 752.
Athanasius (St.) asks the protection of Pope Julius, I. 534.
Athanasius (St.) is the first who bears the title of Archbishop, 1. 664, note 1.
Athenagoras, Apologist, I. 295.
Athens sees the re-opening of the Neo-Platonist School and its suppression, I. 489, 492.
Athens an archiepiscopal see, III. 923.
Attempt against the Temporal Power of the Pope, III. 673, 695, 788 sq.
Attila, II. 31.
Atto, Bp. of Vercelli, II. 423.
Aubespine, I. 46.
Audius and the Audians, I. 757.
Augsburg (Diet and Confession of), III. 76.
Augsburg (Religious peace of), III. 140.
Augusti, I. 59.
Augustine (St.), Bp. of Hippo, I. 342, 423, 487, 496, 510, 549, 576, 594, 653, 674, 696, II. 41.
Augustine (St.) His opinion on the civic virtues of the Romans, II. 24.
Augustine of Canterbury, II. 63.
Augustinus Triumphus, II. 832.
Augustinians, II. 724, III. 944.
Aurelius, Bp. of Carthage, I. 573.
Auricular Confession, I. 424, II. 796.
Austerity, exaggerated, of some Christians, I. 457, II. 1058.
Australasia, III. 962.
Auxilius, Bp., II. 55.
Avars (the), II. 468.
Avignon, II. 819.
Avila, III. 424.
Avitus, Bp. of Vienne, II. 48.
Axuma, I. 504.
Azymites, I. 722, II. 463.

B.

Baader, III. 888.
Babylas, Bp. of Antioch, I. 275, 480.
Bacon (Roger), II. 730, 782.
Baco of Verulam, III. 571, note 2; 593, note 3.
Barhdt, III. 598.
Baius (Michael), III. 424.
Balaamites, I. 226.
Balde (James), S. J., III. 383.

Hosted by Google

Ballerini, III. 535.
Ballerini (Peter), III. 543.
Balmes, III. 720.
Baltzer, III. 889.
Baluze, I. 46.
Bamberg (See of), II. 372.
Baptism, I. 207, 416, 707.
Baptism of St. John, I. 146.
Baptism first ordinarily administered by bishops, I. 390, 709; in case of necessity, laics might administer it, I. 418, 709; time fixed for solemn baptism, I. 419, 708, II. 399; putting off receiving baptism until death, I. 420, 707; putting off the baptism of children, I. 708, II. 399; ceremonies of baptism, I. 707; baptismal feast of the Basilidians, I. 315; blessing of the baptismal water, I. 708.
Baptism (infants, putting off of), I. 708, II. 399.
Baptisteries, I. 691, 709.
Baradai (James), I. 632.
Barbara I. 283.
Bar Cochba, I. 237.
Bardesanes, the Gnostic, I. 327.
Bardo, Archbp. of Mentz, II. 373.
Barletta (Gabriel), II. 1037.
Barnabas (St.) I. 184.
Barnabites, III. 388.
Baronius (Caesar), I. 44, III. 423.
Barruel, III. 628.
Barsumas, Bp. of Nisibis, I. 604.
Bartholomew (St.), in India, I. 184.
Bartholomew, Holzhauser, III. 372.
Bartholomew's (St.) Day, III. 277.
Bartolino of Piacenza, II. 848.
Bartolomeo (Fra), II. 1051.
Basil (St.), Bp. of Ancyra, I. 541.
Basil (St.) the Great, I. 545, 753.
Basil the Macedonian, II. 452.
Basilicae, I. 686 sq.
Basilides, the Gnostic, I. 310.
Basiliscus, Emperor, I. 612.
Basle (Council of), II. 875.
Basnage (James and Samuel), I. 60.
Bauer (Bruno), III. 974, 981.
Baur (of Tübingen), I. 58, III. 971, 978.
Baumgarten, III. 599.
Bautain, III. 839, 903.
Bavaria, II. 98, III. 382, 448.
Bayle, III. 527.
Beatrice, Margravine of Tuscany, II. 492.
Beatus, Abbot of Libana, II. 179.
Beausobre, I. 59.
Becanus, III. 416.
Bec (Abbey and School of), II. 369.
Becker, I. 51.
Becket (St. Thomas à), II. 563.
Bede, the Venerable, I. 40, II. 169, 379.
Beduins, II. 191.
Beghards, Beguines, Begutts, II. 675, 724, 828.
Béla, II. 252.
Belgium, III. 284 sq., 738 sq., 843.
Belisarius, II. 29.
Bellarmin, III. 413 sq.
Bellini, Giovanni, II. 1054.
Bells, I. 691.
Bembo, II. 1003.
Benedict II., Pope, II. 140.
Benedict III., II. 274.
Benedict IV., II. 294.
Benedict V., II. 305.
Benedict VI., II. 308.
Benedict VII., II. 308.
Benedict VIII., II. 314.
Benedict IX., II. 316.
Benedict X., II. 325.
Benedict XI., II. 819.
Benedict XII., II. 835.
Benedict XIII., II. 849, III. 487.
Benedict XIV., III. 489, 390, 620.
Benedict (St.) of Aniane, II. 181, 360.
Benedict Cajetanus, II. 620.
Benedict Levita, II. 272, 343.
Benedict (St.) of Nursia, II. 41.
Benedictines, II. 41, 360, 682, III. 520, 760; in the U. S., III. 943.
Benno (St.), Bp. of Meissen, II. 246.
Bérault-Bercastel, I. 48.
Berengar of Tours, II. 369, 441.
Bergen (See of), II. 233.
Bernard (St.) of Clairvaux, II. 540, 685, 1034.
Bernard (St.), Apostle of the Pomeranians, II. 154, III. 737.
Bernhardi, III. 53.
Bernward, Bp. of Hildesheim, II. 372, 394.
Bertha, Frankish Princess, II. 64.
Berthes, I. 53.
Berthold of Calabria, II. 694.
Berthold, the Franciscan, II. 712.
Berthold, Bp. of Chiemsee, III. 413.
Berthold, Bp. of Yxküll, II. 802.
Berti (Lawrence), I. 50, III. 535.
Bertrand de Got, II. 819.
Bérulle, III. 390.
Beryllus, Bp. of Bostra, I. 356.
Bessarion, II. 933, 1003.
Beurreus (Denys), III. 180.
Beveridge, I. 59.
Beza (Theodore de), III. 149, 180, 311.
Bialobrzeski, III. 170.
Bible Societies (Protestant), III. 1009 sq.
Bible (reading of the), II. 1012; translations of the Bible into the vulgar

Hosted by Google

tongue, I. 501, II. 22, 952, 1011, III. 93.
Biblia Pauperum, II. 1037.
Biel (Gabriel), II. 991.
Billuart, I. 472, III. 519.
Bingham, I. 59.
Binterim, I. 20, II. 13, III. 621.
Birkowski, III. 170.
Birthday for Heaven, I. 302.
Bishops, I. 199 sq.; have the precedence of priests, I. 199, 389, 623; St. Jerome's view on this subject, I. 200; their relation to their dioceses, I. 659, II. 348; and with the Pope, II. 349, 632, 923; they are called priests, I. 201, 390; and exercise supreme authority over both clergy and laity, I. 199; jurisdiction of bishops, I. 465, 648; they are obliged to visit prisoners every Wednesday and Friday, I. 649; rural bishops or chorepiscopi, I. 394, 651, II. 138.
Blanc, I. 48.
Blood, Congr. of the Most Precious, III. 945.
Blumauer, Aloysius, III. 545.
Bobbio, II. 103.
Boccaccio, II. 1002.
Bochart (Samuel), III. 311.
Bockelsohn (John), III. 117.
Bockhold (John), III. 117.
Boehme (James), III. 314.
Boëthius, II. 34, 168.
Bogomiles II. 811.
Bogoris, Bulgarian Prince, II. 469.
Bohemia (conversion of), II. 243.
Bohemian or Moravian Brethren, II. 971, III. 164.
Bojoari, II. 106.
Boleslaus the Pious, II. 244.
Boleslaus Chrobry, II. 241.
Boleslaus II., II. 250.
Boleslaus III. (*Krizywousty*), II. 248, note.
Bolivia, III. 960.
Bollandists, I. 23, note 4.
Bona (Cardinal), III. 534.
Bonaventure (St.), II. 604, 721, 768, 1035.
Bonfrère III., 419.
Boniface (St.), (Winfrid), II. 98 sq.; introduces the custom of holding regular annual synods, II. 117.
Boniface VI., Pope, II. 291.
Boniface VIII., II. 614.
Boniface IX., II. 848.
Boniface, See of St., III, 937.
Bonosus, (Bp. of Sardica), I. 562, 760.
Book (Cath. Book Associa'ns), III. 879.
Book of Common Prayer, III. 204.
Books (Censorship of), II. 912, III. 906.
Boos (Martin), III. 910.
Borgia (St. Francis), III. 384.
Börglum (See of), II. 230.
Borromeo (St. Charles), III. 350, 423, 438.
Borziwoi, II. 243.
Bossuet, I. 47, II. 821, note, III. 148, 502, 518, 520, 540.
Boulogne (Abbe de), III. 703.
Bourdaloue, III. 522.
Bradwardine, II. 990.
Braga (Council of), I. 757.
Brandenburg (See of), II. 245.
Brazil, III. 409, 580, 961.
Bread used in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, I. 211, 722, II. 463.
Bremen, II. 123, 224.
Brenner, III. 888, 1042.
Brenz, III. 80, 87, 320.
Brephotrophia, II. see *Infant Asylums*.
Breslau, II. 243, note, III. 159.
Brethren (the so-called of Jesus), I. 142, note 1.
Brethren of the Free Spirit, II. 674.
Brethren of the Common Life, II. 1025.
Bretagne, or Britanny, II. 51.
Britain (Conversion of), II. 50.
Bridget (St.), II. 57.
Bridget (St.), or Birgit, or Brigitte, II. 843, 997, 1018, 1023.
Brothers of Mercy and Christian Charity, III. 397.
Brothers of the Christian Schools, III. 945.
Brothers of Mary, III. 945.
Bruno (St.), Founder of the Carthusians, II. 689.
Bruno, Bp. of Cologne, II. 371.
Brunswick (turns Protestant), III. 121.
Bucer, III. 87, 114, 310.
Budaeus (latinized of Wm. Bude), II. 1007.
Buddhism, I. 76.
Buenos Ayres, III. 961.
Bugenhagen, III. 190.
Bulgarians, II. 468.
Bull *In Coena Domini*, III. 361, 369, 492.
Bullinger (Henry), III. 98.
Burgundians, II. 30.
Burial, Christian, I. 453, 738.
Burial, Ecclesiastical, refused, I. 739.
Burkhard of Worms, II. 343, 373, 421.
Burkhard of Würzburg, II. 120.
Burmah, III. 928.
Bursfeld (Congregation of), II. 1021.

Hosted by Google

Busch (John), II. 1021.
Busenbaum, III. 417, 519.
Buxtorf, III. 311.
Byzantines, I. 37–43.
Bzovius, I. 45.

C.

Cacault, III. 655.
Cadalous of Parma, II. 331.
Caecilian of Carthage, I. 512.
Caelestius, I. 572.
Caesar, Augusta. See *Saragossa.*
Caesarea (School of), I. 653.
Caesaropapacy, III. 303.
Caillou, III., 841.
Caïnites, I. 319.
Cajetan, II. 922, III. 19, 418.
Calasanze, III. 396.
Calderon, III. 433.
Calixt (George), III. 323, 588.
Calixtines, II. 971.
Calixtus II., Pope, II. 534.
Calixtus III., Pope, II. 897.
Calmet, III. 521.
Calovius, III. 323, 446.
Calvin, III. 143 sq.; his system, III. 150; and his exegesis, III. 310.
Camaldoli (Congregation of), II. 364.
Camaldolites, II. 364.
Campeggio, III. 50, 192.
Canada, III. 937.
Canisius, III. 382, 415.
Canon (of the Mass), I. 717.
Canon of the O. and N. T., I. 509, II. 158.
Canonical (Life), II. 158.
Canonici, II. 351; regulares et saeculares.
Canonization, II. 397.
Canon Law, Studies of, II. 638.
Canons (Collection of), I. 684, II. 269.
Canossa (Henry IV. at), II. 500.
Canterbury (metropolis), II. 65, 379.
Canus (Melchior), III. 412.
Canute the Great, II. 233; (St.) 299.
Cape of Good Hope, III. 930.
Capital punishment decreed against heretics, I. 757, II. 475, 670, 979; and justified by Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin, III. 301; who put it in execution, III. 148.
Capitation tax paid by the Christians, II. 205, 389.
Capito, III. 95, 104.
Capitula clausa, II. 646.
Capitularies of Charlemagne, II. 182.
Capitularies of Interrogation, II. 161.
Capua (Council of), II. 511.
Capuchins (Order of), III. 386.
Carraccioli, III. 33.
Cardinals, II. 344, 644; red and black, III. 659, 673.
Carinthians, II. 239.
Carlstadt, III. 18, 53, 102.
Carmelites, II. 694.
Carpocrates, I. 323.
Carpzov, III. 588, 591.
Cartesius, III. 517.
Carthage, I. 240.
Carthage, Metropolitan Church of Western Africa, I. 240.
Carthage (Councils of), I. 240, 421, 432, 517, 579, 723.
Carthusians, II. 560, 689.
Casas (Bartholomew de Las), II. 1063.
Casimir I., II. 249.
Cassander (George), III. 442.
Cassian (John), I. 586, II. 41.
Cassiodorus, I. 38, II. 34, 168.
Castellio, III. 148, 316.
Castelnau (Peter of), II. 665.
Castro (Christopher), III. 420.
Cataphrygians, I. 345.
Catechetical (School of Alexandria), I. 374.
Catechism (the Roman), III. 356, 573.
Catechumenate, I. 417, 707, 726; studies made in it, I. 425.
Catechumenate of the Manichaeans, I. 340.
Cathari, II. 662; divers names of the C., II. 664.
Catharine of Siena, II. 844, 1017.
Cathedral Chapters, II. 646.
Cathedral Chapters enact their own statutes, II. 646.
Cathedral Chapters independently administer their own estates, II. 646.
Cathedral Chapters exclusively elect the bishops, II. 646.
Cathedral schools, II. 173, 412, 729.
Cave (William), I. 59.
Ceillier, I. 24, 46, ,III 521.
Celestine I., Pope, I. 588.
Celestine V., Pope, II. 612.
Celibacy, I. 398, 656, II. 485.
Celsus, I. 288.
Cenobites, I. 752.
Censorship of Books, II. 912.
Central America, III. 957.
Centuriators, I. 44.
Cerdo, I. 329.
Cerinthus, I. 223.
Cerularius (Michael), II. 462.
Ceylon, I. 503.
Chabot, the Capuchin, III. 640.
Chalcedon (Council of), I. 608.
Chalcidius (Neo-Platonist), I. 492.
Chaldean Christians, I. 604.

Hosted by Google

Challoner, III. 192, 731.
Châlons (Council of) II. 161, 366.
Chantal (St. Frances of), III. 393.
Chanters, I. 652.
Chapels, I. 448.
Chaplains (private), II. 349.
Chapters, II. 351.
Chapters, Controversy of the Three, I. 622.
Chapters, division of the Holy Scripture by, II. 785.
Charisma, s. confirmatio, I. 420.
Charitable institutions, I. 740, II. 641.
Charity (Brothers of), III. 399.
Charlemagne, II. 145 sq., 171.
Charlemagne is crowned Emperor, II. 148.
Charles, Duke of Sudermanland, III. 182.
Charles I., King of England, III. 218.
Charles IV., Emperor, II. 841.
Charles of Anjou, II. 598, 607.
Charles the Fat, II. 288.
Charles the Bald, II. 284.
Charles Martel, II. 50, 713.
Charles V., III. 34, 74, 135, 141.
Charta charitatis, II. 684.
Chartres (School of), II. 369.
Chase (the) forbidden to ecclesiastics, II. 159.
Chateaubriand, II. 821, III. 659 sq.
Châtel (John), III. 565.
Châtel (F. Francis), III. 709.
Chazari, II. 468.
Chemnitz, III. 310, 321, 325.
Chérier, I. 53.
Chieregati, III. 41 (note 1), 45.
Chiersy, or Crécy (Council of), II. 272, 429.
Children, III. 47.
Chili, III. 960.
Chiliasm, I. 224, 347, II. 392.
Chillingworth, III. 330.
China (Propagation of Christianity in), I. 504, III. 405, 406, 576, 930 sq.
Chinese, I. 72.
Choisy, Church Historian, I. 48.
Choirs of the Church, I. 449, 689.
Chorepiscopi. See *Country Bishops.*
Chosroes II., I. 501.
Christianity (causes of the rapid spread of), I. 254.
Christians (the), I. 175.
Christians obtain universal and absolute recognition of their religion, I. 285.
Χρίσμα, I. 420, 710.
Χριστοτόκος, I. 593.
Christ (doctrine of the Church on the divinity and humanity of), I. 150, 365.
Christiern II., King of Denmark, III. 188.
Christiern III., III. 190.
Christopher, II. 1055.
Chrodegang, II. 158.
Chroniclers, I. 41.
Chronology, I. 28.
Chrysostom, I. 486, 546, 557, 655, 727, 738, II. 22; has recourse to Pope Innocent, I. 559.
Church (idea of a), I. 3; the Church established by Jesus Christ, I. 4, 152 sq.; the Catholic Church, I. 359, note 2; visible and invisible Church, I. 512.
Church, Greek, II., 189 sq., 449 sq., 931 sq.
Church, Lutheran, III. 68 sq.
Church, separation of the Church from the Synagogue, I. 190; the Church for the first time acknowledged as a lawful religious body, I. 277, interior division of church edifices, I. 689.
Church, the Catholic, exempted from taxes, I. 466; obtains the rights to accept donations and legacies, I. 466, 648, 658, II. 132, 354.
Church and State, I. 463 sq., 469, 646, II. 135, 185, 253, 485 sq., 529, III. 256.
Church property, II. 355.
Church Architecture, I. 686.
Church (Doctrine of the), its development, sources of it, I. 358 sq., 370 sq., 506, 508.
Church Historians, I. 34 sq. to 61.
Church History, I. 7 sq.; divisions of the same, I. 18; its value, I. 30.
Church Offices, I. 199, 391, 685.
Church Ornaments, I. 685, II. 1041.
Church property (immunity of), II. 357.
Church, punishment inflicted by the, I. 429.
Church revenues (distribution of), I. 658.
Church-song, I. 210, 439, 696 sq.
Church-song, German, II. 1032.
Churches, celebrated, I. 686.
Churches, Gothic, II. 1040.
Chytraeus, III. 182, 310, 321.
Cimabue, II. 1050.
Circumcisionis festum, I. 702.
Circumcelliones, or Circelliones, I. 515.
Cistercians, II. 683, 1056.
Clara (St.) of Assisi, and the nuns of her order, II. 715.
Claudianus Mamertus, I. 695.
Claudianus, Emperor, I. 188.
Claudianus of Turin, II. 222.

Hosted by Google

Clemangis (Nicholas de). See Nicholas.
Clement of Rome, I. 203, 405.
Clement (St.) of Alexandria, I. 295, 371, 374, 375, 460.
Clement (St.), first Bp. of Mentz, I. 251.
Clement II., Pope, II. 319.
Clement III., Pope, II. 577.
Clement IV., Pope, II. 599.
Clement V., Pope, II. 820.
Clement VI., Pope, II. 837.
Clement VII., Pope, II. 847, III. 50, 109, 192.
Clement VIII., Pope, III. 364.
Clement IX., Pope, III. 481.
Clement X., Pope, III. 482.
Clement XI., Pope, III. 485.
Clement XII., Pope, III. 488.
Clement XIII., Pope, III. 491.
Clement XIV., Pope, III. 492, 569.
Clement, Augustus, Archbishop of Cologne, III. 765.
Clement, Flavius, I. 178.
Clement, an Irish heretical Bishop, II. 175.
Clement (Jacques), III. 281.
Clementines, I. 218, 332.
Clergy and Laity, I. 195.
Clerici et Fratres Vitae Communis, II. 1025.
Clergy, I. 195, 395, II. 156.
Clergy (Morals of the), II. 156, 648, 928.
Clergy (Education of the), I. 395, II. 159, 406, III. 514.
Clergy (Prohibitory laws restricting admission among the). I. 652, note 1, II. 134, note 1.
Clergy qualified to take their places in the diet of the empire, II. 132.
Clergy forbidden to become soldiers, to bear arms, or fight, II. 135.
Clerment (Synods of), II. 401, 514.
Cloisters. See Monasticism.
Cloisters produce the first architects, II. 1045; picture of true cloistered life, II. 725; they are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of bishops, II. 343, 365.
Cloisters of women. See Nunneries.
Cloveshove (Council of), II. 379.
Clovis and Clotilda, II. 47.
Clugny (Congr. of), II. 299, 361, 376, 397.
Coadjutor bishops, II. 350.
Cobbett, III. 192 731.
Cocceius, III. 599.
Cochem (Martin), III. 554.
Cochin-China, III. 928.
Cochlaeus, III. 18, 78, 413.
Code of Denys the Little, I. 683.
Code of Frederic II., II. 590.
Coena—Bull In Coena Domini, III. 361, 369, 492.
Colberg (See of), II. 249.
Collecta, I. 712.
Collegia pietatis, III. 590.
Collegial (System of Pfaff), III. 305, 586.
Collegiate Chapters, II. 351.
Collegiants, III. 329.
Collegium Germanicum, III. 372.
Collegium licitum, I. 277.
Collet, III. 519.
Collyridians, I. 761.
Cologne (See of), II. 31, 108.
Cologne, Cathedral of, II. 1046.
Cologne, Archbishoprick, II. 370.
Cologne, (Council of), II. 532.
Coloman, II. 108.
Columba (St.), II. 58.
Columbanus (St.), II. 101, 163.
Comboni, Vic. Ap., III. 935.
Commendoni Papal Legate, III. 168.
Community of goods among the first Christians, I. 207.
Communicatio idiomatum, I. 592.
Communion, or the Eucharist, center of all Christian Worship, I. 211, 433, 710, II. 400, 1027; controversy on the Eucharist, II. 430; feast of Corpus Christi, II. 1029; persons must be fasting in order to receive the Eucharist, I. 723; and under *one* form, I. 720; still communion under *both* forms is granted to the Hussites by the Council of Basle. II. 970; once more by Pius IV., III. 351.
Compromise, III. 366.
Compromise between the Dynamists and Modalists, I. 356.
Conception (feast of the Immaculate), II. 1039; controversy on the Immac. Conception, II. 781, III. 430; declared a dogma, III. 796.
Conceptualism, II. 746.
Conciliabulum of the Oak, I. 559.
Conclave, II. 606, III. 366.
Concomitantia, II. 1028; especially in note *.
Concordance of the Bible, II. 785, III. 419.
Concordats, II. 869, 895.
Concordats of Princes, II. 894, III. 665, 687, 689.
Concord (Formula and Book of), III. 322..
Concordia canonum, I. 684.
Concordia Vitebergensis, III. 112.

Hosted by Google

Concubinage of the Clergy, II. 159, 323, 327, 358, 375, 380, 648, 930.
Conductitii, II. 646.
Conference between the Christian Zacheus and the pagan philosopher, Apollonius, I. 495.
Confessio Augustana, III. 76.
Confessio Tetrapolitana, III. 83.
Confessio Helvetica, III. 115.
Confessio Anglicana, III. 211.
Confessio Belgica, III. 286.
Confessio fidei Tridentina, III. 357.
Confession, I. 425, 727, II. 795.
Confession, auricular, I. 426, 727.
Confession, public, I. 729.
Confessores, I. 301.
Confirmation, I. 207. 420, 709.
Confraternities, I. 651, II. 513.
Confucius, I. 72.
Confutatio Augustanae Confessionis, III. 79.
Congregatio de auxiliis, III. 364.
Congregatio de propaganda Fide, III. 367.
Congregatio Interpretum concilii, III. 358.
Congregatio Inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis, III. 575.
Congruism, III. 427.
Conrad I. (King), II. 300.
Conrad II. (Emperor), II. 316.
Conrad III. (Emperor), II. 543.
Conrad IV. (King), II. 597.
Conrad, Bp. of Constance, II. 372.
Conrad of Marburg, II. 671.
Conradin, II. 598.
Consalvi, III. 655, 665 sq., 674, 683, 689.
Conscience (Examinations of), II. 164, 970.
Consecration of bishops, I. 397.
Consensus repetitus ecclesiae Lutheranae, III. 324.
Consensus Patrum, I. 511.
Consensus Tigurinus, III. 155.
Consistories, Protestant, III. 302.
Consolamentum, II. 663.
Constance (See of), II. 99; Jesuits at, III. 383.
Constans I., I. 474.
Constans II., I. 638.
Constantine the Great, I. 463, 499, 750.
Constantine, Copronymus, II. 144, 211.
Constantine, Pogonatus, I. 640, 762, II. 140, 239.
Constantius, I. 474, 502, 537.
Constantinople, I. 470.
Constantinople, Patriarchate of, I. 610.
Constantinople, Conference of, I. 617.
Constitution of the Cath. Church, I. 389, 646.
Constitution of Lothaire, II. 258.
Constitution (civil) of the Clergy, III. 638.
Constitution dogmatical de *Fide Catholica*, III. 820.
Constitutum, I. 627, and *Judicatum*. I. 624, of Pope Vigilius.
Contarini (Cardinal), III. 113, 419.
Conversions and Converts, III. 442, 539, 847, 864.
Convulsionaries, III. 507.
Copernicus, III. 420.
Copiatae, I. 651, note 3.
Copts, I. 631.
Coran (the), II. 196 sq.
Corbie, II. 123, 225.
Corbinian, II. 107.
Cordova (School of), II, 421.
Cordova (Synod of), II. 390.
Corea, III. 932.
Cornelius, Bp. of Rome, I. 275, 392
Cornelius à Lapide, III. 420.
Corner, III. 422.
Coronation of Kings, II. 139, 342.
Coroticus, II. 56.
Corpus doctrinae Prutenicum, III. 319
Corpus Evangelicorum, III. 585, 618.
Corpus Juris canonici, its origin and division, II. 638, 844; divers editions of it, I. 22, note 2.
Corpus Christi (feast of), II. 1029
Correggio, II. 1054.
Corsica, I. 489.
Cortesius (Paulus), II. 1003.
Corrupticolae, I. 615.
Corvey, II. 123.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, I. 503.
Coster, III. 416.
Cotelier, I. 46.
Cross, Congr. of the Holy, III. 945.
Council (Prototype of a). I. 206.
Councils, Ecumenical; origin of this name and importance of Ecumenical Councils. I. 677 sq.
I. Ecumenical C., 1st, of Nice, I. 523.
II. Ecumenical, 1st, of Constantinople, I. 549, 563.
III. Ecumenical, of Ephesus, I 583.
IV. Ecumenical, of Chalcedon, I 608.
V. Ecumenical, 2d, of Constantinople, I. 627.
VI. Ecumenical, 3d, of Constantinople, I. 640.
VII. Ecumenical, 2d, of Nice, II 214.
VIII. Ecumenical, 4th, of Constantinople, II. 457

Hosted by Google

IX. Ecumenical, 1st Lateran, II. 536.
X. Ecumenical, 2d Lateran, II. 542.
XI. Ecumenical, 3d Lateran, II. 568.
XII. Ecumenical, 4th Lateran, II. 583.
XIII. Ecumenical, 1st, of Lyons, II. 596.
XIV. Ecumenical, 2d, of Lyons, II. 604.
XV. Ecumenical, at Vienne, II. 826.
Ecumenical, of Pisa, II. 853.
XVI. Ecumenical, of Constance, II. 858.
Ecumenical, of Basle, II. 875.
XVII. Ecumenical, of Ferrara-Florence, II. 932.
XVIII. Ecumenical, 5th Lateran, II. 918.
XIX. Ecumenical, of Trent, III. 342.
XX. Ecumenical, of the Vatican, III. 807.
Acts of the Councils. I. 22, note 1.
Provincial Councils, I. 408.
Country-bishops, I. 394, 651, II. 138.
Courland (conversion of), II. 172.
Courland turns Protestant, III. 172.
Court (the Roman), Supreme Court of Appeal, II. 633.
Court chaplains, II. 349.
Coustant, I. 46.
Covenant (the), III. 220.
Cracow (See of), II. 250.
Cranmer (Thomas), III. 195.
Cranz (Albert), I. 42.
Crécy, II. 428.
Crell (Chancellor), III. 308, 322.
Crescent, I. 251; the Cynic, I. 267.
Crescentius, II. 307.
Croatians, II. 239.
Cromwell (Thomas), III. 196, 200.
Cromwell (Oliver), III. 222.
Crosier and Ring, I. 694, II. 340, 487, 534, 690.
Cross (image of the), I. 449, 456; form of the cross in churches, I. 688; it is carried away into Persia by Chosroes II., I. 501; abolition of the death penalty of the cross, I. 466; the cross adopted as a standard, I. 468; mysterious apparition of the cross, I. 284, 482; sign of the cross, I. 457, note 1; exaltation of the holy cross, I. 704.
Crown, the triple of the Pope, II. 631.
Croyland (Abbey of), II. 381.
Crucifixion abolished, I. 466.
Crusades, II. 517; results of, II. 610.
Crypto-Calvinism, III. 319.
Culdees, II. 387.
Cullen (Paul), first Irish cardinal, III 793.
Culm (See of), II. 805.
Cultus, I. 210, 416, 685, II. 395.
Cultus of the Protestants, III. 305.
Cycle (the Dionysian), I. 28, note 1, 39.
Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage, I. 276, 297, 385, 391, 408, 421.
Cyril (St.), Bp. of Alexandria, I. 495, 595.
Cyril (St.) of Jerusalem, I. 546, 700, 713.
Cyril or Constantine, II. 240.
Cyril Lucaris, III. 465.
Cyrus, Bp. of Alexandria, I. 634.
Czerski, III. 914.

D.

D'Achéry Spicilegium, I. 46.
Dagobert, II. 49.
Dalberg (Theodor or Charles of), III. 548, 678, 689.
D'Alembert, III. 527.
Damasus I., Pope, I. 549.
Damasus II., Pope, II. 319.
Damian (St. Peter), II. 324, 325, 399, 410, 424.
Dancers, II. 1058.
Dannenmayr, I. 51.
Dante, II. 719, 822, 1001.
Danz, I. 57.
Darboy, III. 829, 840.
Daub, III. 971.
David of Dinanto, II. 673.
Deanery, II. 137, 352.
Deans and Priors in Monasteries, II. 44.
Deans and Provosts of Chapters, II. 647.
Deans and Provosts in Synodal Courts, II. 164.
Deacons, I. 203, 392; subordinate to Priests, I. 392.
Deaconesses, I. 203, note 3, 651, III. 993.
Decius, Emperor, I. 273.
Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, III. 497; of the Catholic Episcopacy in England, III. 735.
Decretals of the Popes, I. 671, 683; false, II. 269 sq.
Decretals of Gregory IX., II. 592, 639, 642.
Decretals of Boniface VIII., II. 639.
Decretals of Clement V., II. 844.
Decrees of the Popes, I. 22, note 3.

Hosted by Google

Defenders, I. 651.
Definitores, II. 719.
Dei et apostolicae sedis gratia, II. 633.
Deism, III. 334, 649.
Delitzsch, III. 975.
Delsignore, I. 50.
Deluge, I. 102.
Denina, III. 534.
Denmark (Conversion of), II. 227.
Denmark, Protestantism in, III. 188.
Denunciatio evangelica, II. 641.
Denys the Areopagite and his writings, I. 567, note, 618, II. 396.
Denys, Bp. of Alexandria, I. 355, 424.
Denys the Little, I. 28, note 1, 683, II. 39, 89, 168.
Denys, Bp. of Milan, I. 539.
Denys (St.), Bp. of Paris, I. 244, II. 396, 749.
Denys, Bp. of Rome, I. 355.
Dereser (Thaddeus), III. 876, note, 893.
Desiderius the Lombard, II. 145.
Desiderius of Monte Cassino, II. 511.
Dessau (Assembly of), III. 52.
Development of Jesus, I. 143.
Development of Ecclesiastical Science, I. 372, 510.
Development, Doctrinal. See *Doctrinal Development.*
Diaspora, I. 177.
Diderot, III. 527.
Didier de la Cour, III. 390.
Didymus, I. 546, 564.
Diego, Bp. of Osma, II. 665, 709.
Dies Rogationum, I. 700.
Dies Stationum, I. 441.
Diet of Electors, II. 889 sq.
Diet of Worms, III. 38, 113.
Diet of Nürnberg, III. 45, 50.
Diet of Spire, III. 71.
Diet of Augsburg, III. 19, 75.
Diet of Ratisbon, III. 113.
Dio of Prusa, I. 97.
Diocesan Synods, I. 409, 682, II. 137, 351, III. 371.
Dioclesian, I. 277.
Diodore of Tarsus, I. 546.
Diognete (letter to), I. 232, 455.
Dioscorus, I. 606.
Diospolis (Council of), I. 580.
Diplomatics, I. 27, note 2.
Diptychs, I. 717, 718.
Discipline of the Secret, I. 436, 725.
Discipline, Ecclesiastical, I. 212, II. 165, 405.
Dissidents (Pro't in Poland), III. 334.
Dissidia theologica, I. 5.
Ditmar, Bp. of Merseburg, II. 373.
Dobenek (James of), Bp. of Pomesania, III. 156.
Dobmayer, III. 888.
Docetae, I. 225, especially 308.
Doctrinal Development, I. 358, 370, 506.
Dodwell, I. 59.
Doellinger, I. 53, 489, II. 191, 366.
Dogmas (Hist. of), I. 20, note 1, 506.
Dogmatics, Catholic, II. 733, III. 411, 549, 889 sq.
Dolcino, II. 676; his followers condemned, II. 828.
Dombrowka, II. 247.
Dominic (St.), II. 665, 708.
Dominic (Loricatus), II. 410.
Dominica in albis, I. 699.
Dominicans, II. 710, 807.
Domenico Ghirlandajo, II. 1050.
Dominitian, Bp. of Ancyra, I. 621.
Dominitian, Emperor, I. 189.
Domitilla, I. 188.
Donatello, II. 1049.
Donation, pretended, of Constantine, II. 924.
Donatists, I. 515.
Donatus, I. 515.
Donatus, Bp. of Casaenigrae, I. 515.
Dordrecht (Synod of), III. 290, 327.
Dorner, I. 364, III. 965.
Dorpat (See of), II. 803.
Dorovernum, II. 65.
Dositheus, heresiarch of Samaria, I. 171, 220.
Douay Seminary for Catholic Englishmen, III. 214.
Drey, III. 888.
Drontheim (See of), II. 233.
Druthmar, the Grammarian, Monk of Corvey, II. 415.
Ducreux, I. 48.
Ducrey (Martin), III. 659.
Dungal, Monk of St. Denys, II. 222.
Dunin (Martin of), Archbishop of Posen, III. 768.
Duns Scotus, II. 720, 779.
Dunstan (St.), Archbp. of Canterbury, II. 359, 381.
Dupanloup, 814, 828 sq.
Dupin, I. 46.
Dürer (Albert), II. 1055.
Durand, I. 46.
Durand of St. Pourçain, II. 988.
Dynamics, I. 349.

E.

Easter, I. 212, 442 sq., 698; controversy on the celebration of Easter, I. 443, 525; Councils held on this occasion, I. 445.
Easter confession, II. 795.

Hosted by Google

Easter, communion at, II. 795.
East Indies, III. 403, 577 sq., 926 sq.
Ebbo, Archbp. of Rheims, II. 225, 261.
Ἑβδομάς μεγάλη, I. 699.
Ebionites, I. 217.
Eboracum. See *York.*
Eccehard, II. 371, 420.
Ecclesia cathedralis, I. 662; Matrix, ib.; Plebana, ib.
Eck, III. 16, 17, 21, 33, 78, 80, 113.
Eckart (Master), II. 679.
Economists, III. 528.
Ecumenical. See *Councils.*
Ecumenical bishop. See *Episcopus universalis* or *Universal bishop.*
Edelmann, III. 596.
Edessa (School of), I. 653.
Edict of Emperor Antoninus Pius to the Greek communities of Asia, I. 266.
Edict of Constantine at Milan, I. 285.
Edict (theological) of Emperor Justinian, I. 623, 625.
Edict of Justinus, II. 623 sq.
Edict of Emperor Heraclius, I. 637.
Education of the Clergy. See *Clergy.*
Egbert, II. 94.
Egypt, I. 82, 87, 239, II. 203.
Eichhorn, III. 599.
Eichstädt (See of), II. 116.
Einhard, II. 182, 1094.
Ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως, I. 637.
Elbod, II. 95.
Election of bishops, I. 395, 659; the freedom of episcopal elections is gradually destroyed, I. 661, II. 134; determined struggle to re-establish it, II. 340, 510 sq.; participation of the community in episcopal elections, I. 396, 659; the election of bishops is confirmed by the Pope, II. 633 sq.
Elesbaan, I. 503.
Elevation, I. 718, II. 1027.
Elias of Cortona, II. 721.
Eligius, Bp. of Noyon, II. 109.
Elipandus, Archbp. of Toledo, II. 177.
Elizabeth (St.), II. 790, coll. 793.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, III. 208 sq.
Elkesseans, I. 218.
Elvira (Council of), I. 450.
Emanations of the Gnostics. I. 307.
Emanations of the Hindoos, I. 75.
Emancipation of the Catholics in England, III. 730.
Emancipation of slaves. See *Slavery.*
Embolismus, I. 719.
Emmeram (St.), II. 107.
Emmeric, II. 252.
Emperor; the share which the emperor had in episcopal elections, I. 661, II. 134; in the election of popes, II. 254, 302; is styled Vicarius Christi, II. 335.
Empire; the Holy Roman Empire is considered as the constitutional protector of the Church, II. 150; relation of the Empire to the papacy, II. 150; as a token of this relation, the Emperor is ordained a cleric, II. 335; he sings the Gospel in the Mass celebrated by the Pope, II. 860; the symbolical Imperial globe, II. 307; the Empire and the papacy compared to two lights, to the matrimonial alliance, II. 574.
Empire (Latin), II. 582.
Ems (Punctuation of), III. 547.
Emser (Jerome), III. 24, 413.
Encratites, I. 329.
Endura, II. 663.
Energumeni, I. 393, 712.
Enfantin, III. 711.
Engelhardt, I. 57.
England (conversion of), II. 61 sq., 378; turns Protestant, III. 194 sq.; revival of Catholicity, III. 725 sq., 848; Papal Legate in, II. 565.
Enlightenment, false, III. 545.
Ἑνωτικόν, I. 613.
Eon d'Étoile (Eudo de Stella), II. 655.
Epaon (Council of) II. 99.
Eparchy, I. 663.
Ephesus (Robber Synod of), I. 607.
Ephraëm (St., the Syrian), I. 328, 546, 695, 747.
Epicureans, I. 90.
Ἐπίκλησις, I. 710, II. 936.
Epiphanius (St., Bp. of Salamis), I. 546, 556, 558.
Epiphany (Feast of), I. 446, 701.
Episcopal system of the Catholics, II. 818, 923.
Episcopal system of the Protestants, III. 303 sq., 585.
Episcopius, III, 328 sq.
Episcopus universalis, I. 675.
Epistolae obscurorum virorum, II. 1011, III. 30.
Erasmus of Rotterdam, II. 1006, 1011, III. 130, 309.
Eric XIV., III. 180.
Erigena (John Scotus), II. 417, 428, 436, 441.
Erlau (See of), II. 251.
Ermeland (Varmia, See of), II. 805.
Ernesti (J. A.), III. 599.
Erpenius (Thomas), III. 311.
Erwin of Steinbach, II. 1046, note.

Hosted by Google

Eskyl, Archbp. of Lund, II. 550.
Espencaeus (Claudius), III. 273, 419.
Essenians, I. 121 sq.; divided into four classes, I. 218. note 1.
Esthonia (conversion of), II. 803.
Estius (William), III. 421.
Ἑτεροούσιος, I. 539.
Ethelbert, King of Kent, II. 64.
Ethelwold, Bp. of Winchester, II. 381.
Etherius, Bp. of Osma, II. 179.
Eucharist. See *Communion.*
Eucharistic bread, I. 211, 711, II. 401.
Eucharius, 1st Bp. of Treves, I. 251.
Euchites or Euphemites, I. 758.
Eudoxia, I. 558.
Eugene II., Pope, II. 257.
Eugene III., Pope, II. 542.
Eugene IV., Pope, II. 874.
Eugene, Bp. of Carthage, II. 28.
Eulogius, Bp. of Caesarea, I. 580.
Eunomius, Bp. of Cyzicus, I. 540.
Eunapius, Bp. of Sardes, I. 492.
Euric, King of the Visigoths, II. 25.
Eusebians, I. 539.
Eusebius, Bp. of Caesarea, I. 35, 494, 522, 539, 555, 564.
Eusebius, Bp. of Dorylaeum, I. 606.
Eusebius, Bp. of Emesa, I. 565.
Eusebius, Bp. of Nicomedia, I. 522, 530.
Eusebius, Bp. of Vercelli, I. 539, II. 41.
Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch, I. 524, 530.
Eustathius, Bp. of Sebaste, I. 752, 759.
Eutyches, I. 605.
Eutychius, Patr. of Alexandria, I. 43, note.
Euthymius, monk, I. 503.
Euthymius, Zigabenus, II, 466, 811.
Evagrius, I. 37.
Evodius, Bp. of Antioch, I. 179, note 4.
Exarchate, I. 666.
Exarchs, I. 664.
Excommunication, I. 214, 425, 730.
Excommunicatio major et minor, I. 730, II. 411.
Excommunicated persons prosecuted by the State, II. 165.
Exegesis, allegorical, I. 309, 378 sq., 380.
Exegesis, grammatical and historical, I. 338. See also *Holy Scriptures.*
Exemptions, II. 165.
Exorcism and exorcists, I. 393, 652; among Protestants, III. 308.
Extravagantes, II. 844.
Extreme Unction, I. 211, 738, II. 400.
Eybel (Valentine), III. 496, 545.
Eyck (Van, Hubert and John), II. 1055.

F.

Faber, Jesuit, III. 375.
Faber of Constance, III. 92.
Faber, F. W., the Engl. Oratorian, III. 855.
Fabian, Bp. of Rome, I. 243, 275.
Fabion, Bp. of Antioch, I. 624.
Fabre, Jean Claude, the Fr. Orat. I. 47.
Facundus of Hermiane, I. 624.
Faith and Science, I. 377, 564, 751, II. 412, 741, 751.
Farel (William), III. 146.
Farther India, III. 578, 927.
Fasts, I. 211, 442.
Fasting, days of, I. 705.
Fatalism, I. 86, II. 198, III. 99, 972.
Fathers of the Christian doctrine, III. 395.
Faustus, Bp. of Riez, I. 587.
Fé, Sta., III. 938; de Bogotá, II. 959.
Feasts of Christ; idea of them; eccl. feasts, I. 440, 697; the life of a Christian a perpetual feast, I. 211, 440, II. 1026.
Febronius, III. 542.
Fécamp (Abbey and School of), II. 369.
Fecht (Peter), III. 182.
Feilmoser, III. 892.
Felicissimus, I. 430.
Felix of Aptunga, I. 512.
Felix of Urgel, II. 177.
Felix of Valois, II. 698.
Felix II., Pope, I. 614.
Felix V., Pope, II. 890.
Fénélon, III. 503, 515, 522.
Ferrandus (Fulgentius), I. 618, 623.
Ferrara (Council of), II. 932 sq.
Fesch (Cardinal), III. 661, 671, 678.
Festum Annunciationis, B. M. V., I. 703, II. 395.
Festum Assumptionis, II. 395.
Festum Exaltationis sanctae crucis, I. 704.
Festum Innocentium, I. 704.
Festum Nativitatis, II. 395.
Festum Omnium sanctorum, I. 704.
Festum Petri et Pauli, I. 704.
Festum Praesentationis, I. 702, II. 395.
Festum Purificationis, B. M. V., I. 702.
Feudalism, II. 132, 337.
Feuerbach (latest phase of Protestant theology), III 974.
Fèvre (Jacques le), II. 1011.
Fiesole (Angelico), II. 1050.
Filioque, I. 553, II. 452.
Fire (philosophy of), III. 315.

Hosted by Google

Firmicus Maternus, I. 495.
Firmilian, Bp. of Caesarea in Cappadocia, I. 423.
First fruits, II. 650.
Fisher, Bp. of Worcester, II. 1007, III. 198.
Flacius (Matt.), the Illyrian, I. 44, III. 137, 310, 317.
Flagellants, II. 1057 sq.
Flavian of Antioch, I. 548.
Flavian of Constantinople, I. 606.
Flavius Josephus, I. 119.
Flèchier, III. 522.
Fleury, I. 46.
Flodoard, I. 40, II. 423.
Florence (Council of), II. 932.
Florence (Synod of), II. 323.
Flores martyrum, I. 447.
Florez, III. 537.
Florus (Master of Lyons), II. 429.
Flotte (Peter), II. 621 sq.
Fo, I. 72.
Fonseca, *Scientia Dei media*, III. 427.
Fontevrault (Order of), II. 694.
Fools (Feast of), II. 794.
Formosus, Pope, II. 290.
Fossores, I. 652.
Foundling houses, II. 641.
Fox (George), III. 608 sq.
Fra Bartolomeo, II. 1051.
Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole, II. 1051.
France (efforts of Protestantism to spread in), III. 270 sq.
Francesco Francia, II. 1052.
Francis Apulus, II. 978.
Francis of Assisi, II. 712, 807.
Francis of Paula, II. 1024.
Francis of Sales, III. 393.
Francis Xavier, III. 403.
Franciscans, II. 712, 721, 807 sq., III. 944.
Franco, II. 1056.
Franke (August Herman), III. 591.
Frankenberg (Cardinal), III. 547.
Frankfort (Council of), II. 180, 220, 372.
Frankfort (Diets of Princes), II. 892.
Frankfort (Diets of Electors, II. 836, 893.
Frankish Empire (religious condition of the F. Empire), during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, II. 366.
Franks (the), II. 46.
Fratres conventuales, II. 1020.
Fratres minores, II. 715.
Fratres de communitate, II. 1025.
Fratres regularis observantiae, II. 1020.
Fratricelli, or Beghards, II. 828.
Frayssinous, III. 702.
Frederic I., II. 548 sq.
Frederic II., II. 576.
Frederic III., II. 890.
Frederic the Wise, Prince Elector, III. 14.
Frederic I. of Prussia, III. 545.
Frederic William II. of Prussia, III. 965.
Frederic William III., III. 762, 966, 989.
Frederic William IV., III. 769, 990.
Freemasonry, III. 489, 557, 692 sq.
Freethinkers, III. 525, 557, note.
Freisingen (See of), II. 107, 116.
Fretella, II. 23.
Friday (day of fasting), I. 441.
Fridolin, II. 100.
Frint, III. 887.
Frisians (Conversion of the), II. 109.
Fritzsche, III. 976.
Fritzlar (See of), II. 116.
Fructuosus, Bp. of Braga, II. 162.
Fructus medii temporis, II. 845.
Frumentius, Bp. of Abysinia, I. 504.
Fulbert of Chartres, II. 424.
Fulco of Neuilly, II. 582, 1034.
Fulda (Monastery of), II. 119.
Fulda (School of), II. 173.
Fulgentius (Bp. of Ruspe), I. 588, II. 29.
Fullness of Time for the coming of Christ, I. 127.
Fullo (Peter), I. 613.
Functions, ecclesiastical, I. 198, 391, 650.
Funeral orations, I. 739.
Fünfkirchen (See of), II. 251.

G.

Gabriel (Pro-magister), III. 18.
Gaëtano of Thiene, III. 388.
Gailer of Kaisersberg, II. 922, 1036.
Galilei, III. 420.
Galland. St. Gall, II. 103, 173, 420.
Gallandi, III. 535.
Gallerius, I. 278.
Gallican liberties, III. 498.
Gaul (propagation of Christianity in), I. 242 sq., II. 25.
Gamaliel, I. 123, 172.
Gangra (Synod of), I. 656, 759.
Garibald, II. 106.
Garnet, Jesuit, III. 216.
Garnier, I. 46, 571.
Gassner, III. 557.
Gaunilo, Monk, II. 742.

Hosted by Google

Gazette of Augsburg, III. 814.
Gazzaniga, III. 553.
Gebhard, Prince, Elector of Cologne, III. 448.
Gebhard of Constance, II. 513.
Geisa, II. 250.
Geiseric, I. 505. II. 27.
Geissel, Archbp. of Cologne, II. 108, note 2; Cardinal, III. 792, 877.
Gelasius II, II. 533.
Gemara, I. 253.
Gemistius Pletho, II. 1004.
General (Seminaries), III. 545.
General (Vicars), II. 647.
Generationism, I. 572.
Gennadius, I. 587.
Genseric, I. 505, II. 27.
Gentilis, III. 148.
Genuflectentes, I. 428.
Geography, ecclesiastical, I. 27.
George, Duke of Saxony, III. 24, 37, 54.
Georgia, I. 502 (Iberia).
Gerard (the Franciscan), II. 722 sq.
Gerard John, III. 312.
Gerard, Paul, III. 312.
Gerard, Bp. of Toul, II. 372.
Gerard (Segarelli). See *Segarelli.*
Gerbert, II. 311, 423, 438; Abbot, III. 553.
Gerbet, III. 777.
German hymn-books, II. 1032, III. 422.
Germans (Religion of the), II. 13; introduction of Christianity among them, II. 20 sq., 96 sq.; peculiar situation of the Church among them, II. 125 sq.; their scientific efforts and first results thereof, II. 173.
German theology, heretical, II. 971; orthodox by Berthold, Bp. of Chiemsee, III. 413.
Germanus (St.), Bp. of Auxerre, II. 13.
Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, II. 210.
Gerson, II. 850, 855, 863, 997.
Gerstungen (Council of), II. 508.
Gfrörer, I 58.
Ghibellines and Guelfs, II. 576.
Ghiberti of Florence, II. 1049.
Gieseler, I. 57, 408, II. 649, III. 83.
Giftschütz, III. 554.
Gilbert de la Porrée, II. 753, 1034.
Gilimer, II. 29.
Giotto, II. 1050.
Girardus, II. 473.
Giunta of Pisa, II. 1050.
Glass (staining), II. 1044.
Glassius (Solomon), III. 310.
Glastonbury, II. 381.
Globe, the imperial, II. 307, 355.
Gnesen (Archbishopric of), II. 249.
Gnosis (false), I. 204, 304.
Gnosis (true), I. 371.
Gnosticism, I. 304; Egyptian, I. 311; Syrian I. 325; Ebionitic, I. 332.
Goa, Schism of, III. 927.
Goar (St.), Hermit, II. 108.
Goch (John de), II. 974.
God (Cath. doctrine on), I. 363.
Godeau, Bp. of Vence, I. 46.
Godehard, Bp. of Hildesheim, II. 372.
Godfathers and Godmothers, I. 418.
Godfrey of Bordeaux, II. 1034.
Godfrey of Bouillon II. 522.
Godfrey of Lukina, II. 804.
Godfrey of Strasburg, II. 787.
Godfrey of Vendôme, II. 534.
Godomar, II. 31.
Goffine, III. 554.
Golius, III. 311.
Gomarus, III. 326.
Gonzalez, Thyrsus, III. 537.
Görres, I. 410, note 1, II. 732, III. 897.
Göthe, III. 605.
Gother, III. 731.
Goths, II. 20.
Gottschalk, II. 245, 425.
Grabe, I. 59.
Grace (Cath. doctrine and controversy on), I. 571, II. 425, 780, III. 424, 505.
Grammont (Order of), II. 688.
Gran, Archbishopric of), II. 251.
Granvella (Cardinal), III. 285, 425.
Gratian (Decretum of), II. 638.
Gratius (Ortwin), II. 1010.
Graveson, I. 48.
Greek (Church), II. 189, 449, 810; reunites with the Catholic Church, II. 937.
Greek learning, II. 811.
Greeks (Religion and Morals of the Pagan), I. 85.
Greenland (Discovery and Conversion of), II. 235, 720, III. 617.
Gregorian Chant, I. 696.
Gregory, Bp. of Elvira, I. 543.
Gregory, Bp., the Illuminator, I. 501.
Gregory Bp. of Nazianzum, I. 495, 549, 555, 654, 679, 695.
Gregory, Bp. of Nyssa, I. 546, 564, 728, 732.
Gregory, Bp. "Thaumaturgus," I. 380.
Gregory, Bp. of Tours, I. 39, II. 49.
Gregory of Utrecht, II. 121.
Gregory of Cyprus, II. 213.
Gregory of Heimburg, II. 893.
Gregory (St.), the great Pope, I. 657, 675, 695, II, 36, 62, 45.

Hosted by Google

Gregory (St.) II., Pope, II. 113, 140, 210.
Gregory (St.) III., Pope, II. 114, 140, 210.
Gregory IV., Pope, II. 226, 259 sq.
Gregory V., Pope, II. 309.
Gregory VI., Pope, II. 318.
Gregory (St.) VII., Pope, II. 446, 481 sq
Gregory VIII., Pope, II. 533, 570.
Gregory IX., Pope, II. 588 sq.
Gregory X., Pope, II. 604 sq.
Gregory XI., Pope, II. 843.
Gregory XII., Pope, II. 851.
Gregory XIII., Pope, III. 278, 362.
Gregory XIV., Pope, III. 364.
Gregory XV., Pope, III. 366.
Gregory XVI., Pope, III. 694 sq.
Groot (Gerard), II. 1025.
Gropper, III. 113, 413.
Grotius (Hugo), III. 311, 327, 445, 599.
Gruet, III. 148.
Guadalaxara, III. 955.
Gualbert, John (Congregation of), II. 364.
Guardian, II. 718.
Guericke, I. 57, III. 975, 985, 1019.
Guiana, III. 960.
Guibert of Nogent, II. 1035.
Guibert, Abbot of Gembloux, II. 725.
Guibert, Bp. of Ravenna, Antipope, II. 506.
Guido, Archbishop of Milan, II. 378.
Guido Reni, III. 433.
Guido of Siena, II. 1050.
Guido of Arezzo, II. 1056.
Guigo (Prior), II. 691.
Guilds, II. 641.
Guitmund, II. 733, note 2.
Γυναικες συνεἰσακτοι, I. 402. Cfr. II. 648.
Gundebald, II. 30.
Guntamund, II. 29.
Günther (Anthony) of Vienna, III. 889, 904.
Gustavus Adolphus, III. 453.
Gustavus Vasa, III. 176.
Guyon (Joane), III. 513 sq.
Gyrovagi, I. 753.

H.

Hadeby (School of), II. 225.
Hacon the Good, II. 231.
Hadrian, Emperor, I. 264.
Hadrian I., Pope, II. 145.
Hadrian II., Pope, II. 241, 283, 457.
Hadrian IV., Pope, II. 547 sq.; his bull concerning Ireland, II. 554 sq.
Hadrian V., Pope, II. 607.
Hadrian VI., Pope, III. 44 sq.
Half Fast-days, I. 441.
Halberstadt (See of), II. 123.
Hales (Alexander), II. 766.
Halifax, III. 937.
Halitgar, Archbishop of Cambrai, II. 163, 417.
Halitgar, Monk, II. 225.
Hamburg (Archbishopric of), II. 226.
Hamburg-Bremen, II. 224.
Hamel III. 519.
Hammer (See of), II. 233.
Hands (imposition of), I. 197, 207, 420.
Hanno (St.), Archbishop of Cologne, II. 330, 486.
Harold Haarfagr, II. 231.
Harold Blaatand, II. 232.
Harold the Dane, II. 224 sq.
Harduin, I. 22, note, III. 522, 565.
Harless, III. 985.
Harms (Nicholas), III. 984.
Hase, I. 57, III. 1019.
Havelberg (See of), II. 245.
Haymo (Bp. of Halberstadt), I. 40, II. 173, 415.
Hayti, III. 958.
Hebrew (Study of), II. 1008, 1009.
Hedwige (St.), Queen of Poland, II. 1059.
Hefele, I. 53, II. 421, 819, III. 894.
Hegel, III. 971.
Hegesippus, I. 34.
Hégira, II. 194.
Heidelberg (Catechism of), III. 325.
Helding (Michael), III. 136.
Helena, I. 459, 686.
Heliogabalus, I. 270.
Helladius of Toledo, II. 26.
Helsen, Abbé, III. 740.
Helvetia, II. 98.
Helvetius, III. 528.
Helvidius, I. 761.
Heming (St.), Archbishop of Upsala, II. 1060.
Hemling, Hans, II. 1055.
Hengstenberg, III. 975, 986.
Henke, I. 56.
Henning Brabant, III. 308.
Hennuyer (John of Lisieux), III. 279.
Henriciani, II. See Petrobrusians, II. 656.
Henry I., II. 301.
Henry II., II. 314.
Henry III., II. 321.
Henry IV., II. 328, 332, 482 sq.
Henry V., II. 525.
Henry VI., II. 569.
Henry VII., II. 822.
Henry VIII., King of England, III. 61, 192.
Henry Duke of Brunswick, III. 721.

Hosted by Google

Henry, Archbishop of Gnesen, II. 578.
Henry, Monk of Lausanne, II. 656.
Henry, Apostle of the Finlanders, II. 231.
Henry of Langenstein, II. 848.
Heptarchy. II. 62.
Heraclius, I. 501, 633 sq.
Herbert (Count), III. 525.
Herbst (Jesuit), III. 180.
Herder, II. 3, 39, III. 603.
Heresy, its import, I. 4, 359, note 2.
Heresy, its advantage, I. 359.
Heretics, the first, I. 217.
Heretics, their condemnation to death, II. 474; first instance of this kind, I. 757; reasons for such proceedings in the M. A., II. 670; but examples of the same nature among Protestants, III. 148, 301; which are not justified by the same motives, II. 984.
Heretics (controversy on the validity of the baptism of, I. 420.
Heribert, Heresiarch, II. 473.
Heribert, Archbishop of Milan, II. 474.
Herlembald, II. 376.
Herlen, Frederic, II. 1055.
Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, III. 122, 136.
Herman Contractus, I. 41, II. 424.
Herman, Bp. of Metz, II. 495.
Herman of Salza, Grand Master, II. 507.
Herman, Archbishop of Freiburg, III. 870 sq.
Hermas, I. 187, 232.
Hermenegild, II. 26.
Hermes, III. 888, 901 sq.
Hermias, Apologist, I. 295.
Hermits, I. 453, 748.
Hermogenes, I. 325.
Herod, the Great, I. 115, 190.
Herod Antipas, I. 190.
Herod Antipater, I. 115.
Herod Agrippa. I. 175, 190.
Heroism of the Christians, I. 299 sq., 456, 500, II. 390.
Herrnhutters, III. 606 sq.
Hessels (John and Leonard), III. 425.
Hesshusius, III. 320.
Hessia (Conversion of), II. 116.
Hesychasts, II. 812.
Hetzer, III. 93.
Hieracas, Gnostic, I. 347.
Hierarchy, I. 8, 198 sq.
Hierocles, I. 292, 492.
Hieronymites, II. 1023.
Hierotheus, Monk, II. 250.
Hilarion (St.) I. 752.
Hilary (St.) of Arles, I. 676, II. 33.
Hilary (St.) of Poitiers, I. 538, 544, 549, 647.
Hilary the layman, I. 586.
Hilda, Abbess, II. 91.
Hildebert, Bp. of Mans, II. 530, 656, 746. II. 1034.
Hildebrand, Monk, II. 318, 321, 445.
Hildegard (St.), II. 653, 763.
Hildesheim (See of), II. 123.
Hildesheim (School of), II. 373. 424.
Hildesheim (introduction of Protestantism in), III. 122.
Hincmar of Rheims, II. 222, 272, 356. 416. 428.
Hincmar of Laon, II. 284.
Hindoos, I. 74.
Hippo (Synod of), I. 724.
Hippolytus, I. 353.
Hirschau (Congr. of), II. 173, 362, 420.
Hirscher, III. 891.
History (importance. division, and exposition of), I. 5 sq.
Hock, II. 421. III. 900.
Hofbauer, III. 755.
Hogstraaten, II. 1010, III. 16.
Hohenstaufen, II. 547 sq.
Holbein, II. 1055, III. 433.
Holden (H.), III. 444.
Holland, III. 284 sq., 738 sq., 845.
Holy Ghost (Descent of the), I. 167 sq.
Holy Ghost (Cath. doctrine on the), I. 368, II. 453; controversy on, I. 550 sq., II. 452.
Holy Scriptures; relation of the Holy Scriptures to tradition, I. 362.
Holy Scriptures; interpretation of the, I. 362, 508, III. 344.
Holy Scriptures; translations of the. See *Translations*.
Holy Seasons. See *Seasons*.
Holzhauser, Bartholomew, III. 372.
Homage. II. 339, 514, 537.
Homerites, I. 504.
Homes for the Aged, II. 641.
Homiliarium, II. 160, 367, 402.
Honorius I., Pope, I. 633 sq.
Honorius II., Pope, II. 331, 539.
Honorius III., Pope, II. 587, 710.
Honorius IV., Pope, II. 609.
Honorius, Emperor, I. 487, 582.
Hontheim, I. 51, III. 543.
Hormisdas, I. 614.
Hortig, I. 52.
Hosius (of Cordova), I. 523, 539.
Hosius (Stanislaus), III. 169, 181, 350, 413.
Hospices, free, for strangers, II. 641.
Hospitalers, II. 702.
Hospitals, II. 641.
Hospitia Scotorum, II. 384.

Hosted by Google

Hottinger (Henry), I. 60.
Hroswitha, II. 422, 1000.
Huesca (Synod of), I. 682.
Huet, Bp. of Avranches, III. 518.
Hug, I. 473 (note 1), III. 892.
Hugh Capet, II. 309.
Hugh a St. Caro, II. 785.
Hugh, Monk of Fleury, II. 534.
Hugh Grotius, III. See *Grotius.*
Hugh of Sens, II. 757.
Hugh of St. Victor, II. 758, 763, 785.
Huguenots in France, III. 272, note 2.
Humanists, II. 1005, III. 16.
Humbert of Romon, II. 1035.
Hume, III. 526.
Humiliati, or the Humbled, II. 699.
Hunerich, I. 505, II. 28.
Hungary (Christianity in), II. 250.
Hungary (Protestantism in), III. 172.
Hungary (National Council of), III. 755.
Huns, II. 31.
Huss (John), II. 953 sq.; his death, II. 902; there was no violation of safe-conduct in his regard, II. 963.
Hussites, II. 967, III. 25, 164.
Hussites (the Four Articles of the), II. 970.
Hutten (Ulrich), II. 1011, III. 29.
Hutter (Leonard), III. 324.
Hy (Monastery on the island of), II. 59.
Hydroparastatae, I. 329.
Hyginus, Bp. of Cordova, I. 756.
Hymenaeus, I. 205.
Hymn-books, German, II. 1037, III. 422.
Hymns of the Church, I. 210, 439, 695, II. 1032.
Hypatia, I. 487, 492.
Hypsistarians, I. 764, note 2.

I.

Ibas of Edessa, I. 604, 607, 622.
Iberia. See *Georgia*, I. 502.
Iceland (Conversion of), II. 234; Protestant, III. 191.
Ichthyophagi, II. 191.
Iconium (Synod of), I. 421.
Iconoclasts, II. 210.
Idolatry, forbidden, I. 484, II. 166.
Ignatius of Antioch, I. 232 sq., 390, 401 (note 2), 405, 437.
Ignatius, Patr. of Constantinople, II. 450, 457.
Ignatius of Loyola, III. 374.
Ildephonse, Archbishop of Toledo, II. 26, 169.
Illuminati (Order of the), III. 557.
Images, I. 449, 691, II. 1048 sq.
Images (Controversy on), in the East, II. 206; in the Frankish Empire, II. 218.
Immunities of Clergy, II. 135, 356, 641.
Imperium mundi of the Emperor of the West, II. 150.
Imposition of hands, I. 197, 207, 420.
Impostores, tres, II. 594, note 1.
Ina, King, II. 80.
Incarnation (Heresy on the dogma of the), I. 592 sq., 604 sq., 611.
Incense burnt at the altar, I. 713.
Independents, III. 222.
India (Hither), I. 74, 503, III. 926; (Farther), III, 928.
Indians. See *Hindoos.*
Indifferentism, I. 638, III. 868, 1015.
Indigent (Hospitals for the), II. 641.
Indigent (Schools for the), II. 39.
Indulgences, I. 429, 733, II. 410, 797, 1006, III. 11, 20, 356, 575.
Indulgences for the faithful departed, II. 799.
Infallibility, papal, III. 821.
Infant-asylums, II. 641.
Infralapsarii, III. 326.
Ingolstadt, III. 383.
Innocent I., Pope, I. 559, 580.
Innocent II., Pope, II. 539, 686.
Innocent III., Pope, II. 574, 648, 665.
Innocent IV., Pope, II. 595, 807.
Innocent V., Pope, II. 607.
Innocent VI., Pope, II. 832.
Innocent VII., Pope, II. 851.
Innocent VIII., Pope, II. 905.
Innocent IX., Pope, III. 364.
Innocent X., Pope, III. 367, 478.
Innocent XI., Pope, III. 483.
Innocent XII., Pope, III. 484.
Innocent XIII., Pope, III. 486.
Inquisition, Ecclesiastical, II. 671, 979.
Inquisition, Spanish, II. 984.
Inquisitores haereticae pravitatis, II. 981 (note 1), III. 575.
Inscriptions, I. 25, note 5.
Inscription of Autun, I. 436.
Inspiration, I. 508, 565, III. 418.
Interdict, II. 368, 408, 548, 796.
Interim of Ratisbon, III. 114.
Interim of Augsburg, III. 136.
Interim of Leipsig, III. 137.
Introitus, I. 711.
Investitures (Controversy on), II. 487, 519, 526; works on this subject, II. 481 (note 1), 524 (note 2).
Iona (island of), II. 59.
Irenaeus (St.) Bp. of Lyons, I. 243, 363, 405, 410, 437.
Irene (Empress), II. 214.
Ireland (Conversion of), II. 51, 383.
Ireland (Island of Saints), II. 57.

Hosted by Google

Ireland (Attempts to Protestantize) III. 235 sq.
Ireland remains Catholic, III. 736.
Ireland (her present situation), III. 858 sq.
Irvingites, III. 1006.
Isenbiehl, III. 556.
Isidore (St.) of Pelusium, I. 601.
Isidore (St.), Archbishop of Seville, I. 683, II. 26, 162, 168, 269.
Isidore (Pseudo), II. 268.
Islam, II. 197.
Isochristoi. I. 622.
Israelites (the), I. 100 sq.
Isserinus, Bp. II. 55.
Itala, I. 509.
Italy, II. 374.
Ithacius of Ossonuba I. 756.
Ivo or Yves of Chartres, II. 530, 1034.

J.

Jaballah, I. 503.
Jablonski, I. 60.
Jacobellus, II. 967.
Jacobi, III. 970.
Jacobites, I. 632.
Jacopona, author of the *Stabat Mater*, II. 1032.
Jagello, II. 1059.
Jäger, I. 48.
Jahn, III. 892.
Jamblicus, I. 489.
James the Elder, beheaded, I. 175.
James the Younger, son of Alpheus, brother of the Lord, first Bishop of Jerusalem, I. 183.
James Baradai. See *Baradai.*
James de'Laderchi, I. 45.
James de Voragine, II. 793.
James Zanzalus, I. 632.
Jansenius (Cornelius), Bp. of Ghent, III. 419.
Jansenius (Cornelius), Bp. of Ypres, and author of the "*Augustinus*," III. 428, 501 sq.
Japan, III. 404, 932.
Jarcke, III. 864, 887.
Jeremiah II., Patriarch of Constantinople, III. 464.
Jerome (St.), I. 486, 549, 567, 580, 654, 673, 760, II. 23, 41.
Jerome of Prague, II. 965.
Jerusalem (destruction of), I. 190; an event most important for the success and spread of the Christian Church, I. 191.
Jerusalem (Council of), I. 206.
Jerusalem (audacious but vain efforts of the Emperor Julian to rebuild the temple of), I. 481.
Jerusalem conquered by Chosroës II., I. 501.
Jerusalem conquered by Saladin, II. 570.
Jerusalem (Synod of), I. 580.
Jerusalem (Dignity of the Patriarch in the Church of), I. 667, III. 792.
Jesuats'(Order of), II. 1022.
Jesuits; foundation of the Order of J., its constitution and object, III. 375 sq.; they can not be commanded to commit a sin, III. 378, note 2; their labors, III. 169, 173, 381 sq., 428 sq.; suppression, III. 562 sq.; and restoration of the Jesuits, III. 683; Jesuit Colleges in America, III. 685.
Jesus Christ, I. 138 sq., 148 sq.
Jews (religious and political history of the), I. 100 sq.; they obtain privileges from Julian the Apostate, I. 481.
Jews (conversion of), II. 1061.
Jews (persecution of), II. 1015, 1060.
Jezdedsherd, I. 500.
Joachim of Floris, II. 678, 722.
Joachim I. of Brandenburg, Catholic, III. 84.
Joachim II., Protestant, III. 112.
Joane, pretended female Pope, II. 266.
Joasaph II., Patr. of Constantinople, II. 934.
Johannites, II. 702.
John (St.), Baptist, I. 144.
John (St.), his feast, I. 704.
John (St., the Evangelist), I. 184, 189, 226.
John I., Pope, II. 34.
John II., Pope, I. 618.
John IV., Pope, I. 636.
John VIII., Pope, II. 286, 459.
John IX., Pope, II. 242, 293.
John X., Pope, II. 294.
John XI., Pope, II. 296.
John XII., Pope, II. 298 sq.
John XIII., Pope, II. 244, 306.
John XIV., Pope, II. 308.
John XV., Pope, II. 308.
John XVI., Pope, II. 310.
John XVII., Pope, II. 313.
John XIX., Pope, II. 316.
John XXI., Pope, II. 607.
John XXII., Pope, II. 829.
John XXIII., Pope, II. 857.
John III., King of Sweden, III. 180.
John of Antioch, I. 603.
John of Avila, III. 424.
John Braske, Bp. of Linköping, III. 177.
John Buridan, II. 989.
John Capistrano, II. 1036.

Hosted by Google

John Cassian, I. 586.
John Columbino, II. 1023.
John, Constant (the), III. 70.
John, Cross (of the), III. 393.
John Damascene, I. 644, II. 210, 432, 760.
John, Falkenberg (of), II. 871.
John, Faster (the), I. 666, 675.
John of Fidanza, II. 768.
John Frederic, the Magnanimous, III. 121.
John of St. Giles, II. 720.
John of Gishala, I. 192.
John van Goch, II. 974.
John of God, III. 397.
John the Grammarian, II. 216.
John Gualbert, II. 364.
John of Jandun, II. 831.
John of Jerusalem, I. 573.
John, Knights of St. John, II. 702.
John of Leyden, III. 117.
John, Archbp. of Lyons, II. 530.
John Magnus Gothus, III. 177.
John de Matha, II. 698.
John of Mecklenburg, II. 246.
John the Monk, II. 626.
John of Monte Corvino, II. 807.
John of Oliva, II. 723.
John, Bp. of Pavia, II. 289.
John Philoponus, I. 616.
John Polemar, II. 875.
John of Ragusa, II. 875.
John, Archbp. of Ravenna, II. 280, 375.
John of Salisbury, II. 761.
John the Scholastic, I. 682.
John, Archbp. of Taranto, II. 882.
John Tolomei, II. 1022.
John of Tritenheim, I. 42.
John Turrecremata, II. 891.
John of Vicenza, II. 1034.
Jonas, Bp. of Orleans, II. 222.
Jordan, Bp. of Posen, II. 247.
Jornandes, II. 168.
Josaphat II. of Constantinople, II. 932.
Joseph II., III. 493, 544, 545, 620.
Joseph of Arimathea, I. 161.
Journalism (Catholic) in North America, III. 949.
Journalism (Catholic) in Belgium, III. 844.
Journalism (Catholic) in England, III. 855.
Journalism (Catholic) in France, III. 842.
Journalism (Catholic) in Germany, III. 897.
Journalism (Catholic) in Holland, III. 846.
Journalism (Catholic) in Italy, III. 790.
Journalism (Catholic) in Portugal, III. 831.
Journalism (Catholic) in Spain, III. 833.
Jovian (Emperor), I. 403.
Jovinian (Monk), I. 759.
Jubilee (year of), II. 797.
Judaizing (Christians), I. 216.
Judas Maccabeus, II. 113.
Judas the Apostle, I. 154.
Judicatum of Pope Vigilius, I. 624.
Julian the Apostate, I. 476.
Julian of Eclanum, I. 582.
Julian of Halicarnassus, I. 615.
Julianists, I. 515.
Julin (See of), II. See *Wollin.*
Julius I., Pope, I. 675.
Julius II., Pope, II. 915.
Julius III., Pope, III. 346.
Jura dominicalia, II. 643.
Jurisdiction of the Clergy, I. 465, II. 356.
Jus canonicum, II. 638, 844.
Jus circa sacra, I. 661, note 3.
Jus Primarum precum, II. 640.
Jus spolii et regalium, II. 355, 640, 651.
Jus stolae, II. 354.
Justin (St.), Martyr, I. 267, 294, 455.
Justin I., Emperor, I. 614.
Justin II., Emperor, I. 631.
Justinian I., Emperor, I. 489, 617, 689, II. 34.
Justinian II., Emperor, I. 763, II. 140.
Justiniani, Expounder of the Holy Scriptures, III. 422.
Justus, Archbp. of Canterbury, II. 66.
Juvavia. See *Salzburg.*
Juvenalis (Patriarch of Jerusalem), I. 611.
Juvencus, Priest, I. 695.

K.

Καθαροί. See *Cathari.*
Kahnis, III. 987.
Kambula. See *Peking.*
Kant, III. 966 sq.
Karnkowsky, Archbp. of Gnesen, III. 169, 184.
Kastner, III. 887.
Katerkamp, I. 52.
Kellner, III. 896.
Kenrick, F. P., his works, III. 942.
Kepler, III. 310.
Kerz, I. 51.
Kettler, Godhard von., III. 172.

Hosted by Google

Kiew (Metropolis of), II. 471; the Metropolitans in union with the Roman Church, II. 471.
Kiew (Council of), II. 471.
Kilian (St.), II. 108.
Kiss of Peace, I. 211, 713, 719.
Kistemaker, III. 893.
Klee (Henry), III. 889 sq., 893.
Klein, I. 53.
Kliefoth, III. 987.
Klopstock, III. 604.
Kläpfel, III. 552.
Knights (Religious Orders of), II. 702 sq.
Knights of the Sword, II. 707, 803.
Knights of St. John, II. 702.
Knights, Brethren of Prussia, II. 805.
Knights Templars, II. 702.
Knights, Teutonic, II. 705, 1058.
Knipperdolling, III. 117.
Knox (John), III. 229 sq.
Kranach (Luke), III. 30.
Kraus (F. X.), I. 54, 129–132, II. 7 sq.
Kurtz, I. 58, III. 988.

L.

Labat, III. 529.
Lacombe, III. 513.
Lacordaire, III. 707, 713,
Lactantius, I. 385.
Lainez, III. 273, 384.
Lamartine, III. 702.
Lambert of Aschaffenburg (Hersfeld), I. 41.
Lambruschini, III. 698.
Lamennais, III. 702, 707 sq.
Lamoricière, III. 788.
Lamps, perpetual, I. 690.
Lamy (Bernard), III. 579.
Landulf, II. 375.
Lanfranc, Archbp. of Canterbury, II. 331, 424, 444.
Lang (Matthew), II. 919.
Lange, I. 698.
Languages, gift of, I. 167, 210.
Laodicea (Council of), I. 724.
Lapland, II. 1060.
Lapsi, I. 274.
Lateran Synod, I. 639, II. 536, 542.
Lateran Ecumenical Council, II. 568, 583, 918 sq.
Latin, language and liturgy, II. 401, 1032.
Latitudinarians, III. 330.
Latrocinium. See *Ephesus.*
Laud, Archbp. of Canterbury, III. 219.
Launoy, I. 46.
Laura, Old and New, I. 752.
Laureacum. See *Lorch.*
Laval University, III. 948.
Lawrence (St.), Deacon and Martyr, I. 276.
Lawrence, 2d Archbp. of Canterbury, II. 67.
Lawrence Valla, I. 42, II. 1003, 1013.
Lay Abbots, II. 162, 360.
Laymen (λαός), I. 197, 389; are allowed to baptize in case of necessity, I. 418.
Lazarists, III. 397.
Lazi, I. 502.
Lectors, I. 392, 652, 712.
Legacies made to the Church, I. 648, 658.
Legates of the Pope, I. 671, II. 633.
Legend, the Golden, II. 793.
Legends, I. 26.
Legio fulminatrix, I. 267.
Legio Thebaica, I. 282.
Legislation supported by religion, II. 182 sq. 667 sq.
Leibnitz, III. 540, 594.
Leidrad, Archbp. of Lyons, II. 181.
Leipsig (Disputation of), III. 22 sq.
Leisentritt, III. 422.
Lejay (Polyglot Bible of), III. 382, 417.
Lelong (Bibliotheca sacra of), III. 521.
Lenfant, I. 59.
Leo (St.) I., Pope, I. 606, 675, II. 31, 140.
Leo (St.) II., Pope, I. 642 sq.
Leo (St.) III., Pope, II. 139, 147, 254, 255.
Leo (St.) IV., Pope, II. 265, 413.
Leo VI., Pope, II. 294.
Leo VII., Pope, II. 296.
Leo VIII., Pope, II. 304.
Leo IX., Pope, II. 321, 327, 374, 444, 446.
Leo X., Pope, II. 920, III. 18, 33.
Leo XI., Pope, III. 365.
Leo XII., Pope, III. 691.
Leo XIII., Pope, III. 1032, 1045.
Leo of Achrida, II. 463.
Leo, the Armenian, I. 763, II. 216.
Leo, the Isaurian, I. 763, II. 140, 207, 214, 217.
Leo Judae, III. 93, 310.
Leo, the Philosopher, II. 461.
Leontius, monk, I. 620.
Leopold, Duke of Austria, II. 572.
Leopold II., Grand Duke of Tuscany, III. 536.
Leovigild, II. 26.
Leporius, Priest of Carthage, I. 593.
Leprosoria, II. 641.
Lesley (Norman), III. 229.
Lessius, Jesuit, III. 418.
Lessing, III. 543, 602.

Hosted by Google

Leutizes, II. 245.
Levelers, III. 223.
Levites. Deacons, I. 392.
Libanius, I. 485, 491.
Libellatici, I. 275.
Liberius, Pope, I. 538, 541 sq.
Liberties (Gallican), III. 483, 497.
Libertines of Geneva, III. 147.
Libri Carolini, II. 219, III. 306.
Licinius, I. 467.
Liebermann, III. 887.
Liége (School of), II. 373, 422.
Life, religious, social, and moral of the Christians, I. 207, 454, 739, II. 153, 790, 1014.
Life, the whole of a Christian a feast. See *Feast.*
"Liga sancta," or "Holy Alliance of Nürnberg," III. 112.
Liguori (St. Alphonsus), III. 531 sq.
Lincoln (See of), I. 253.
Lindisfarne, II. 75.
Lingard (John), II. 50, III. 191, 731.
Lingerides (Claude and John de), III. 423, 424.
Linköping (See of), II. 231.
Lissa (General Synod of the Lutherans and Calvinists), III. 561.
Litanies, III. 573.
Literature (the most modern Catholic) in Germany, III. 886 sq.
Literature (Catholic) in England, III. 731.
Litterae formatae et communicatoriae, I. 391, 397, 407.
Lithuania, II. 1058.
Liturgy of the apostolical constitutions, I. 439.
Liturgy of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Constantinople, etc., I. 710 sq.; the Western, Rome, Milan, I. 711, II. 402; the Gallican, II. 403; the Mozarabic, II. 402; the Slavic, II. 241, 244.
Liturgy of Cranmer, III. 203.
Liturgy of John III., King of Sweden, II. 182.
Livonia (Conversion of), II. 802.
Livonia passes over to Protestantism, III. 172.
Locherer, I. 52.
Locke (empiricism of), III. 524, 594.
Λόγος, I. 228, 543.
Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, I. 365, and
Λόγος προφορικός, I. 366.
Λόγος σπερματικός, I. 376.
Lollhards, II. 725.
Lombards, II. 35 sq.
Lombard (Peter), II. 736, 755.
London (See of), I. 253, II. 67.
London (Council of), II. 381.
Loos (Cornelius), II. 984, III. 440.
Lorch (Metrop. Church of), I. 251, II. 106, 240, 372.
Loreto, II. 1031.
Lothaire I., II. 256, 275.
Lothaire II., II. 258, 539.
Louis the Bavarian, II. 830.
Louis the Child, II. 291.
Louis the German, II. 264, 286.
Louis VII., King of France, II. 543.
Louis IX. (St.), King of France, II. 600, 619.
Louis XII., King of France, II. 911.
Louis XIII., King of France, III. 282.
Louis XIV., King of France, III. 283, 483, 517.
Louis XV., King of France, III. 630.
Louis XVI., King of France, III. 631.
Louis XVIII., King of France, III. 699.
Louis the Mild, II. 254, 366.
Louis Philip of France, III. 706 sq.
Louis, King of Bavaria, III. 759.
Louis of Granada, III. 424.
Love-feasts. See *Agapae.*
Luca Signorelli, II. 1052.
Lucian of Samosata, I. 289, 440.
Lucian, priest of Antioch, I. 519, 565.
Lucidus, a priest of Gaul, I. 589.
Lucifer of Cagliari (Calaris), I. 538, 541.
Luciferians, I. 545.
Lucilla, I. 513.
Lucius II., Pope, II. 541.
Lucius III., Pope, II. 570.
Lücke, interpreter of the Bible, III. 977.
Ludger (St.), Bp. of Münster, II. 123.
Ludmilla, II. 243.
Lugo, S. J., Cardinal, great theologian, III. 537.
Luitpold, Archbp. of Mentz, II. 425.
Luitprand, I. 40, II. 423.
Luke (St.), the Evangelist, I. 176.
Luke della Robbia, II. 1049.
Lullus, Archbp. of Mentz, II. 115.
Lullus Raymundus, II. 783, 807.
Lumper, I. 137.
Lunéville (peace of), III. 654.
Lund (See of), II. 230.
Lupold of Bebenberg, II. 832.
Lupus (St.), Abbot of Ferrières, II. 428.
Lupus (St.), Bp. of Troyes, II. 31, 32.
Luther, III. 8 sq.; condemned, III. 35; his lax system, III. 27; his marriage, III. 67; his translation of the Bible, III. 93; his catechism, III. 71; his principles on matrimony,

Hosted by Google

III. 69; his principles on faith. III. 77; his opinion on certain books of Holy Writ, III. 39, note; on the Fathers of the Church, III. 107, note; his fatal tendencies, III. 56, 81 sq., 129, 130; his system of exegesis, III. 129, note 3; his death, III. 128; judgment on him, III. 132.
Lutherans, III. 320.
Lutheran controversies, III. 315 sq.
Luxeuil, II. 102.
Lyons (Councils of), I. 590, II. 596, 604.

M.

Mabillon, I. 46.
Macarius, the Elder and Younger, I. 752.
Macedonians, I. 549, 593.
Macedonius, Bp. of Constantinople, I. 549.
Macchiavelli, II. 1004.
MacCloskey (John), first North American Cardinal, III. 793.
Mack (discharge of), III. 777.
Macon (Council of), I. 698, 702.
Macra (Saint), Synod of, II. 340.
Maëstricht (See of), II. 108, 370.
Magdeburg Metropolitan See of), 245.
Magi, I. 81, 499.
Magna Charta libertatum, II. 581.
Magnentius, I. 474.
Magyars, II. 250.
Mahommed, II. 191 sq.
Mai (Cardinal), III. 698.
Maid of Orleans, II. 1018.
Maistre (de), III. 702.
Major (George), III. 316.
Majorinus, I. 513.
Malchion, Priest, I. 351.
Maldonatus (interpreter of the Bible), III. 416, 421.
Malebranche, III. 519.
Mamachi, I. 49, III. 535.
Mamertus, Archbp. of Vienne, I. 695, 700.
Mamertus, Priest. See *Claudianus.*
Manetti, II. 1009.
Manharters, III. 910.
Manichaeism, I. 336, 364.
Manichaeism, severe measures employed by the Emperors against it, I. 341.
Manning (J. H., Cardinal), III. 857.
Mannon, II. 420.
Mansi, I. 49, 724, note 1, III. 535.
Mantegna, Andrea, II. 1054.
Mantua (Council of), II. 331.
Manu (laws of), I. 74.
Manual labor of Monks, I. 750.
Manumissio per testamentum, II. 643.
Manutius (Paul), III. 416.
Marat, III. 642 sq.
Marca (Peter de), I. 46.
Marcellus of Ancyra, I. 524, 531, 560.
Marcellus II., Pope, III. 348.
Marcia, I. 268.
Marcianus, I. 607.
Marcianus of Arles, I. 411.
Marcion, I. 329.
Marcionites, do not observe the discipline of the secret, I. 436.
Marcus Aurelius, I. 266.
Mardonius, I. 477.
Maret, III. 828.
Marheineke. III. 971, 1016.
Mariana, III. 383, 396.
Marinus II., or "Martin III.," Pope, II. 296.
Maris the Persian, I. 604.
Marius Mercator, I. 573, note 1.
Mark (St.) the Evangelist, I. 184, 239.
Mark, John, I. 176.
Maronites, I. 643, II. 945, III. 474.
Marsilius Ficinus, II. 1004.
Marsilius of Padua, II. 831.
Martène I. 46.
Martin I., Pope, I. 639.
Martin IV., Pope, II. 608.
Martin V., Pope, II. 868.
Martin (St.) of Tours, I. 757, II. 41, 396.
Martin of Dunin. See *Dunin.*
Martini, Archbp. of Florence, III. 535.
Martyrs and Martyrdom, I. 299.
Martyrs, veneration of, I. 302, 454.
Maruthas, Bp. of Tagrit in Mesopotamia, I. 500.
Mary (the Blessed Virgin), I. 141, 184.
Mary, Immaculate Conception of, and controversy on the same, II. 781, 1030.
Mary, feast of the Nativity of, II. 395.
Mary, cultus or veneration of, II. 397.
Mary, days dedicated to her honor, I. 702, II. 399.
Mary, Queen of England, III. 206.
Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, III. 213, 232.
Mary, Brothers of, III. 945.
Masius (Andrew), III. 419.
Mass, Sacrifice of the, I. 439, 668, III. 56, 350.
Masses said for the souls of the faithful departed, I. 720.
Masaccio, II. 1051.
Massacre of the Irish. III. 252.
Massalians, I. 758.
Massilians, I. 586.
Massillon, III. 522.

Hosted by Google

Maternus, first Bp. of Cologne, I. 251.
Maternus Firmicus, I. 495.
Mathilda (Countess), II. 492.
Mathilda, her donation, II. 512.
Mathilda, Queen of England, II. 492.
Mathurins. See *Trinitarians.*
Matrimony, Sacrament of, I. 208, 450, 735.
Matrimony, it is declared to be indissoluble, I. 208. 452, 736.
Matrimony, subject to sacerdotal blessing, I. 451, 735.
Matrimony forbidden with pagans, I. 451, 736.
Matrimony forbidden with heretics, I. 736.
Matrimony forbidden with blood relations to the seventh degree, I. 737. II. 400; this prohibition restricted to the fourth degree, II. 400.
Matteo de'Bassi, III, 386.
Matthew (St.), Apostle, I. 183.
Matthew Lang, Bp. of Gurk, II. 919.
Matthew of Paris, I. 41.
Matthew (Father), III. 738.
Matthias, Apostle, I. 167, 184.
Matthiesen, III. 117.
Maur. (Congr. of St.), III. 520.
Maurice (St.) of the Thebaean Legion, I. 282.
Maurice of Saxony, III. 134, 137.
Maurus (St.), disciple of St. Benedict, II. 45.
Maurus, Bp. of Bari, I. 241.
Maximilian I., Emperor, III. 7 sq.
Maximilian of Bavaria, III. 448.
Maximilian of Mexico, III. 954.
Maximilla, I. 344.
Maximus the Neo-Platonist, I. 477.
Maximus the Emperor, I. 757.
Maximus the Abbot, I. 636.
Mazarin, III. 480.
Mechitarists, III. 473.
Mecklenburg (See of), II. 245.
Medina (Bartholomew of), III. 417.
Meinwerk, II. 373.
Meinwerk, his School, II. 424.
Meissen (See of), II. 245.
Melanchthon, III. 24, 47, 53, 76 sq., 109, 319.
Melania, I. 556.
Melbourne, III. 963.
Melchisedechians, I. 350.
Meletius of Lycopolis (Schism of), I. 432; its extinction, I. 526.
Meletian Schism at Antioch, I. 546.
Meletius of Mopsuestia, I. 602.
Meletius of Sebaste, I. 547.
Melito, Apologist, I. 294.
Mellitus, Archbp. of Canterbury, II. 66.
Memnon, Bp. of Ephesus, I. 599.
Menander, I. 223.
Mendicant Orders, II. 707 sq.
Mendicant Orders; opposition against them, II. 719.
Meng-tse, I. 72.
Mennas, Patr. of Constantinople, I. 619.
Mennonites, III. 331.
Menochius, Interpreter of Holy Writ, III. 421.
Mensurius, Bp. of Carthage, I. 512.
Mentana, III. 789.
Mentz (Metropolitan See of), II. 108.
Mentz (Councils of), II. 161, 332, 426.
Mercier, III. 648.
Merseburg (See of), II. 245, 370.
Mersennus, III. 420.
Mesopotamia (Theol. School of), I. 653.
Metempsychosis, I. 76, 84.
Methodists, III. 610.
Methodius, Bp. of Tyre, I. 556.
Methodius, Bp. of Pannonia and Moravia, II. 240.
Metropolitan (the three great sees), I. 407, 663.
Metropolitan (force of the organization), I. 406, 663. II. 136, 348.
Metropolitans, I. 406.
Metropolitans (jurisdiction of), II. 348.
Metropolitans; oath of fidelity taken by them to the Pope, II. 633.
Metz (See of), II. 108.
Metz (Council of), II. 361.
Mexico, III. 952 sq.
Mezzofanti, Cardinal, III. 698.
Michael (Feast of St.), I. 705, II. 395.
Michael Cerularius, II. 463.
Michael of Cesena, II. 1020.
Michael III., Emperor, II. 449.
Michael Palaeologus, II. 814.
Michael the Stammerer, II. 217.
Michaelis (David), III. 599.
Michael Angelo, II. 1052.
Michelis, I. 132, III. 894, 901.
Michl, I. 51.
Mieczyslaus, II. 247.
Middle Ages (general character of), II. 1.
Middle Ages (peculiar character of the M. A., from a religious point of view), II. 125.
Migne, II. 414, III. 713.
Milan; edict of toleration, granting full liberty to the Christians, promulgated there, I. 285.
Milan (Councils of), I. 538, 561.
Mileve (Council of), I. 581.
Milites Christi. See *Donatists.*

Hosted by Google

Milner, Apost. Vicar in England, III. 731.
Milner, Church Historian, I. 61.
Miltiades, Apologist, I. 294.
Miltitz (Charles of), III. 20.
Minden (See of), II. 124, 370.
Minims, II. 1024.
Minnesaenger, II. 787, 794.
Minorites. See *Franciscans.*
Minutius (Felix), Apologist, I. 296.
Miracles (gift of), I. 210, 257, II. 124; faith in, II. 791, note.
Missa, I. 711.
Missa Catechumenorum, I. 439, 711.
Missa Fidelium, I. 713.
Missa Marcelli, III. 436.
Missa privata, II. 401.
Missa pro defunctis, I. 720, 739.
Missa praesanctificatorum, I. 721.
Missa Votiva, I. 720.
Missal, III. 356.
Missi dominici, II. 129.
Missions, modern, III. 397, 401, 532, 921.
Missions, Institutes and Congregations for, III. 397, 531, 922 sq.; in America, III. 944.
Missions, Protestant, III. 616, 1007.
Miter, I. 693.
Modestus, Apostle of the Carinthians, II. 239.
Mohammed. II. 192.
Möhler (John Adam), III. 865, 890, 895.
Molanus (Abbot), III. 539.
Molina (Louis), III. 426 sq.
Molinos (Michael), III. 511.
Monarchia ecclesiastica Siciliae, II. 328, 516.
Monarchians, I. 348.
Monks and Monasticism, I. 453, II. 161, 681 sq.; origin, aim, and scope of monastic life, I. 744; monks originally all laymen, I. 753; congregations of monks erected in the East by Pachomius, Ammonius, and Hilarion, I. 752; in the West by Martin of Tours and Benedict of Nursia, II. 40 sq.; religious reformation by St. Benedict of Aniane, II. 360.
Monastic Congregations and Orders, II. 360 sq., 681 sq., 728, 1019, 1022, III. 386 sq., 530 sq., 836.
Mongols, II. 807.
Monges (Peter), I. 613.
Monica (St.), I. 576.
Monophysites, I. 611, 631.
Monothelites, I. 633 sq.
Monstrance, II. 1027.
Montalembert, II. 8, 786, III. 707, 835, 845.
Montanus and Montanists, I. 342.
Monte Cassino, II. 43, 363.
Montesquieu, III. 527.
Montfaucon, I. 46.
Montholon, III. 681, note 2.
Montpellier (Council of), II. 667.
Moore (Thomas), III. 732.
More (Sir Thomas, Chancellor), II. 1007, III. 199.
Moral theology, II. 258; III. 316, 519, 891.
Moravia (Conversion of), II. 240.
Moravian Brethren, II. 971, III. 164, 606, 1008.
Mörlin, III. 319.
Mormons, III. 1004.
Moses, I. 103 sq.
Moses of Chorene, I. 502.
Mosheim, I. 55.
Mozarabians, II. 112.
Mozarabic liturgy, II. 402 sq., 1028.
Mühlberg (battle of), III. 135.
Müller (Adam), III. 971.
Müller (Henry), III. 312.
Müller (Julius), III. 271.
Münscher, I. 60.
Münster (See of), II. 123, 370.
Münzer (Thomas), III. 57.
Muratori, I. 49; III. 534.
Muret, on St. Bartholomew's day, III. 278, note *.
Murner (Thomas, satirist), III. 30, note 2.
Music (religious), I. 694, II. 1055, III. 435, 881.
Myconius, III. 98.
Mysteries of Paganism, I. 63, 86.
Mysticism, II. 737, 747, 762, 993, III. 312; false mysticism, III. 511.

N.

Nakatenus, Jesuit, III. 554.
Name, (Christian in), I. 498.
Names (change of names at papal elections. First instance of the kind), II. 298.
Nantes (Edict of), III. 281; its revocation, III. 283.
Ναός, I. 689.
Napoleon Bonaparte, III. 654, 668.
Napoleon III., III. 834 sq.
Νάρθηξ, I. 689.
Nas (John), III. 413.
Natalis, Alexander, I. 46, III. 519.
Natalis, Bp. of the Antitrinitarians, I. 350.
Natalitia Apostolorum, I. 704.
Natalitia Martyrum, I. 302, 456.
National (Council of Paris), III, 670.

Hosted by Google

Nativity (Feast of the), I. 447, 702.
Nativity, Chronological fixing of the year of the N. of Christ, I. 139 sq.
Naumburg (See of), II. 245.
Naxos, III. 923.
Nazarenes, I. 218.
Neander, I. 56, 476, 647, note, II. 488, 502, 732, III. 979.
Nectarius, Patr. of Constantinople, I. 549, 731.
Nefried of Narbonne, II. 181.
Neo-Caesarea (Council of), I. 403.
Neo-Evangelicals, or Pietists, III. 986.
Neo-Platonism, I. 291, 381, 475, 492.
Neo-Pythagoreans, I. 290.
Neri (St. Philip), III. 389, 437.
Nero, Emperor, I. 179.
Nerva, Emperor, I. 189.
Nestor, Historian of the Russian Church, II. 472.
Nestorius, I. 592.
Nestorians, I. 592, III. 474.
Nestorians in China, I. 503.
Netherlands (Protestantism in the), III. 284.
Netherlands (the Catholic Church in the), III. 738, 843 sq.
Newman, III. 848 sq.
Nice (Councils of), I. 446, 523, II. 214.
Nicephorus Callisti. I. 43.
Nicetas Choniates, II. 810.
Nicolaitanes, I. 224.
Nicolai's German Library, III. 557.
Nicholas I., Pope, II. 275, 469.
Nicholas II., Pope, II. 325.
Nicholas III., Pope, II. 607.
Nicholas IV., Pope, II. 610, 807.
Nicholas V., Pope, II. 834, 895, 924, 971.
Nicholas de Clemangis, II. 849, 879, 992, 1019.
Nicholas of Cusa, II. 878, 886, 894, 900, 923, 929, 931.
Nicholas of Flüe, II. 1016.
Nicholas de Lyra, II. 1008.
Nicholas of Methone, II. 810.
Nicholas of Monte Corvino, II. 807.
Nicholas of Myra, II. 472.
Nicholas of Pisa, II. 1049.
Nicole, III. 416, 501.
Nidaros. See *Drontheim.*
Nihus (Bartholomew), III. 323, 445.
Ninian, British Bp., II. 58.
Niobes, Stephen, I. 616.
Nisibis (Theol. School of), I. 653.
Nobles generally chosen canons, II. 646.
Noëtus, I. 353.
Nogaret (William de), II. 621, 627.
Nominal Catholics, I. 498, III. 881.
Nominalism, II. 742, 990.
Nomocanon, I. 683.
Nonantula (Placidus of), II. 531.
Nonantula (Monastery of), II. 375.
Non-conformists, III. 212.
Nonnus, Monk, I. 602.
Norbert (St. Norbert founder of the Premonstratensians), II. 692.
Norbertines. See *Premonstratensians.*
Noris, Cardinal, I. 49, 628, note 2, III. 534.
Normans, II. 233, 322, 327 sq., 484, 506.
Northumbria, conversion of, II. 69.
Norway (conversion of), II. 231.
Norway turns Protestant, III. 191.
Notaries, I. 651.
Notker of St. Gall, II. 371, 421.
Notker Labeo, II. 421.
Notker, Bp. of Liége, II. 373.
Notker Physicus, II. 421.
Nourry (Nicholas le), I. 46.
Novatian at Rome, I. 387, 431.
Novatus at Carthage, I. 430.
Number, total, of Christians, III. 1023.
Nunciatures, I. 671, III. 369, 542, 548.
Nuns, I. 754.
Nunneries, I. 754, II. 360.
Nurnberg. (Assembly of Princes at), II. 577; diet of, III. 44, 50.

O.

Oberthür, III. 550, 888.
Oblates (Congr. of), III. 389.
Oblations or Offerings, I. 398, 713.
Obotrites, II. 245.
Obstacles opposed to the Propagation of Christianity, I. 257, 498.
Occam (William), II. 831, 838, 989, 1020.
O'Connell, III. 726.
Odensee (See of), II. 229.
Oderic Raynaldus, I. 45.
Oderic Vital, I. 41.
Odilo and Odo, Abbots of Clugny, II. 362.
Odoacer, II. 33.
Oecolampadius III. 95 sq., 105, 310.
Oecumenius, Bp. of Tricca, II. 466.
Offertory, I. 713.
Officials, Episcopal, II. 647.
Officium, B. M. V., II. 399.
Officium, Gregorii VII., III. 488.
Offroy de la Mettrie (Julian), III. 528.
Olahi (Nicholas), Archbp. of Gran, III. 173.
Olaf (the Fat), II. 226.
Olaf Trygvesen, II. 232, 235.

Hosted by Google

Olaf (St.), II. 232.
Olaf, Skötkonung II. 230.
Oldenburg (See of), II. 245.
Oleg, II. 470.
Olga, II. 470.
Olier, III. 424, 942.
Oliva, II. 804.
Olivetan (Peter), III. 144.
Olivetans, II. 1022.
Olmütz (See of), II. 243.
Olshausen, III. 977.
Omer (St.), II. 109.
Ὁμιλία, I. 712.
Ommiades, II. 203.
Ὁμοιούσιος, I. 539.
Ὁμοούσιος, I. 351, 366, 525, 539.
Ophites, I. 316.
Optatus of Mileve, I. 511, 513, 516.
Orange (Council of), I. 588.
Orarium, I. 693.
Oratorians, Italian, French, and English, III. 389, 735.
Oratorio; origin of this name, III. 437.
Ordeals, II. 155.
Orders, religious. See *Monasticism.*
Orders, mendicant, II. 707; their influence, II. 719; and opposition raised against them, 719.
Orders, military and religious, II. 700; in Prussia, II. 805.
Ordination, I. 199.
Ordination of bishops, I. 396, 734.
Ordinationes absolutae, II. 159.
Ordo de redemptione captivorum. See *Trinitarians.*
Ordo B. Mariae de Mercede. See *Trinitarians.*
Ordo S. Brigittae, s. Salvatoris, II. 1024.
Orebites (Party of Hussites), II. 970.
Organ, I. 697; II. 403, 1055.
Organic (articles), III. 657.
Oriental (organization of studies), II. 1008.
Origen, I. 296, 374, 378, 456.
Origenist (Controversy), I. 554, 620.
Original Sin (propagation of), I. 572.
Orlando di Lasso, III. 437.
Orleans (Councils of), I. 682. 698, II. 49.
Ornaments (church), I. 685, II. 1044 sq.
Orosius (Paulus), I. 38, 488, 496, 580.
Orphan Asylums, II. 38, 641.
Orphans, Hussite sect, II. 970.
Orsi, Church Historian, I. 49.
Osbor (Synod of), II. 332
Osiander (Luke), I. 44, III. 318.
Osiandrist (Controversy), III. 157, 318.
Osnabrück (See of), II. 123.
Ostensoria, II. 1027.
Ostiarii, I. 393.
Ostrogoths, II. 21, 33.
Oswald (St.), Bp. of Worcester, II. 381.
Otfried of Weissenburg, II. 416.
Othlo. Benedictine of Ratisbon, II. 425.
Otho I., Emperor, II. 301, 303, 305; his Diploma, II. 302.
Otho II., Emperor, II. 307.
Otho III., Emperor, II. 308.
Otho IV., Emperor, II. 576.
Otho of Bamberg, II. 801.
Otho of Freisingen, I. 41.
Οὐσία, meaning and use of, I. 366.
Overberg, III. 679, 895.
Oxford (Council of), II. 1026.
Oxford (School of), III. 734, 849.

P.

Pacca, Cardinal, III. 548, 666, 674, 683.
Pachomius, I. 754.
Pack (Otho de), III. 72.
Pactum Calixtinum, II. 536.
Paderborn (See of), II. 123.
Paderborn (School of), II. 373, 424.
Paganism, I. 64, 484; the Gospel announced to the pagans, I. 174; obstacles put in the way of the Gospel, I. 257.
Paganism revived by Julian, I. 477; reappearing in literature, II. 1003.
Paganus, Paganismus, I. 484.
Pagi (Anthony), I. 45.
Pagi (Francis), II. 255, note.
Painting on glass, II. 1044.
Palestine (Theological School of), I. 653.
Palestrina, III. 435.
Palladius, II. 51.
Pallavicini, I. 49, III. 34, 81, 132, 340, 351, notes 1 and 2.
Pallium of bishops, I. 693.
Pallium of catechumens, I. 419.
Pallium of metropolitans, I. 693, II. 140.
Pallium, a toga ad pallium, I. 419.
Pallium (metropolitan power attached to the), II. 343. 633.
Palmieri, II. 1009.
Pamphilus, priest, I. 555.
Pantaenus, I. 238. 374.
Pantheism of the pagans, I. 91; and of the heretics, II. 418, 654, 672.
Papa, peculiar title of the Bishop of Rome, I. 675.
Papal (system), II. 818, 923.
Paphnutius, I. 656.
Papers, Hist. and Polit., III. 866, and passim.
Papias, I. 224, 227.
Parabolani, I. 651.

Hosted by Google

Parabrahma, I. 76.
Paracelsus, III. 313.
Paraguay (Jesuit Mission in), III. 409.
Paris (See of), I. 243; Metropolitan See, III. 564, note 2.
Paris (University of), II. 729.
Paris (Council of), II. 221.
Paris (Francis), III. 507.
Parker (Matthew), III. 210.
Παροικία, I. 394, 662.
Parochial rights in episcopal cities, II. 354.
Πάροχος, I. 663.
Pascal, III. 501, 518, 565.
Paschal I., Pope, II. 256.
Paschal II., Pope, II. 523.
Paschal III., Pope, II. 560.
Paschal (confession), II. 795 sq.
Paschasius Radbert, II. 416 sq., 431.
Passagians, II. 657.
Passau (See of), II. 116, 157, 242, 373.
Passau (treaty of), III. 139.
Passionists, III. 945.
Pastoral of Gregory the Great, II. 38.
Πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, I. 443.
Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, I. 443.
Patarini (association of the), II. 376.
Patarini (sect of the), II. 376.
Patriarchate (extent of its power), I. 664.
Patriarchate (Roman), I. 665 sq.
Patriarchs, Christian, I. 663; determination of their rights I. 668.
Patriarchs, Ecumenical, I. 666, II. 464.
Patrician dignity of the Frankish kings, II. 148.
Patrick (St.), Apostle of Ireland), II. 52 sq.
Patrimony of Peter, II. 142; importance and necessity of it, II. 821, note.
Patripassionists, I. 352.
Patronage (right of), I. 663, II. 349.
Paul (St.), Apostle, I. 171 sq.; his ideas on the Church, I. 204; his journeys, I. 175 sq.
Paul of Alexandria, I. 631.
Paul of Constantinople, I. 642.
Paul Cortesius, II. 1003.
Paul the Deacon, II. 160, 171.
Paul of Emesa, I. 601.
Paul of Samosata, I. 350.
Paul of Thebes, I. 453, 748.
Paul Warnefried, II. 171, 375.
Paul II., Pope, II. 901.
Paul III., Pope, III. 341.
Paul IV., Pope, III. 349.
Paul V., Pope, III. 355.
Paulianists, I. 351; the baptism of the Paulianists declared invalid, I. 424.
Paulicians, I. 761, II. 473, 667.
Paulinus (St.) of Nola, I. 695.
Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileïa, I. 630, II. 171.
Paulists, III. 945.
Paulus, Professor of Heidelberg, III. 926.
Pavia (Council of), II. 315, 375, 400.
Peace, kiss of, I. 211, 713, 719.
Pearson, I. 59.
Peasants (war of the), III. 58.
Pedobaptism, I. 708.
Peking, II. 807.
Pelagianism, I. 573 sq.; is suppressed in the East, I. 581 sq.
Pelagius, British Monk, I. 572.
Pelagius I., Pope, I. 630.
Pelagius II., Pope, I. 680.
Pelagius, Roman Apocrisiarius, I. 621.
Pelagius Alvarus. See *Alvarus.*
Pelbart, II. 1037.
Pelican (Conrad), III. 311.
Pella, I. 193.
Pelliccia, I. 49, III. 535.
Pellisson, III. 540.
Penance (Sacrament of), I. 209, 425, 727.
Penance books, I. 732.
Penance, public, I. 729, II. 164, 409.
Penitential Discipline, I. 425 sq., 727, II. 164, 409 sq., 799, 1057 sq.
Penitential Discipline at first directed by the bishops, I. 429.
Penitentiary (Priests), I. 429, 731; he is the bishop's representative *in foro interno*, II. 648.
Penitents divided into four classes, I. 428, 729, II. 162, 409, 795, 1066.
Pentecost, I. 167, 446.
Pepin of Heristal, II. 50.
Pepin, II. 50, 143, 144; his donation, II. 143; augmented by Charlemagne, II. 145.
Pepuzians, I. 345.
Peregrinus Proteus, I. 267.
Περιοδευτής, I. 662.
Perpetua and Felicitas (SS.), I. 269.
Perpinian, III. 383.
Perrone, III. 696, note 1.
Persecutions of the Christians, I. 169, 261, 285, 498, II. 27.
Persia (Propagation of Christianity in), I. 238, 499; persecutions of the Christians in, I. 503.
Perugino, II. 1052.
Pest-houses for lepers, II. 641.
Petavius, I. 46, III. 412, 519.
Peter (St.), Apostle, I. 154, 174; head of the Church, I. 180, 196; his apostolic labors, I. 179; establishes him-

Hosted by Google

self at Rome, I. 179; where he is crucified, I. 181; his twenty-five years Roman pontificate, I. 181, note 4.
Peter d'Ailly, II. 852, 863.
Peter of Alexandria, I. 432.
Peter Amandus, III. 157.
Peter of Andlo, II. 833.
Peter Patr. of Antioch, II. 465.
Peter of Bruis, II. 655.
Peter of Castelnau, II. 665.
Peter Chrysologus, I. 606.
Peter Comestor, II. 730.
Peter Flotte, II. 621.
Peter the Fuller, I. 612.
Peter Galle, II. 5, III. 177.
Peter the Hermit, II. 520.
Peter Jacobson, Bp. of Westeräs, III. 177.
Peter, Patr. of Jerusalem, I. 622.
Peter Lombard. See *Lombard.*
Peter Mongus, I. 613.
Peter Nolasco, II. 699.
Peter of Pisa, II. 177.
Peter of Poitiers, II. 757.
Peter the Venerable, II. 683.
Peter *de Vineis*, II. 590, 597.
Peter Waldus, II. 658.
Peter's pence, II. 379. III. 789.
Peterson (Olaf and Lawrence), III. 176.
Petrarca, II. 841. 1001.
Petrikau (Council of), III. 166.
Petrobrusiani, II. 656.
Pflug (Julius), III. 113, 121, 136.
Phantasiastae, I. 616.
Pharisees, I. 120.
Philip (St.), Apostle, I. 184.
Philip the Arabian, I. 272 sq.
Philip Augustus, King of France, II. 572, 577.
Philip IV., the Fair, II. 618.
Philip of Hessia, III. 69, 116, 135; his bigamy, III. 119.
Philip of Suabia, 576.
Philip II., of Spain, III. 285.
Philippine Islands, III. 962.
Philippists, III. 320.
Phillips, I. 23, II. 13. III. 894.
Philo, I. 118.
Philology, ecclesiastical, I. 27, note, 1.
"Philopatris" (Dialogue), I. 491.
Philoponus (John), I. 616.
Philosophy and theology, I. 376, 386.
Philosophy, modern, III. 593, 970 sq.
Philostorgius, I. 37.
Philostratus, I. 290.
Photinus, I. 561.
Photius, II. 450, 466; his followers condemned, II. 461.
Physiocrats, III. 528.
Piacenza (Synod of), II. 514.
Piarists, III. 396.
Pico della Mirandola, II. 1004.
Picts, II. 58.
Pietism, III. 590, 986, 1004.
Pilate, I. 145.
Pilgrimages to the Holy Land, I. 741, II. 519, III. 925.
Pilgrimages to the Shrines of Saints, II. 248.
Pilgrimage to Rome, II. 392, 410.
Pilgrimage to Compostella, I. 242, II. 404.
Piligrim, Bp. of Passau, II. 251, 371.
Pirhing, III. 555.
Pirkheimer (Willibald, III. 31, 34, 64, 103.
Pisa (Council of), II. 853 sq.
Pistorius, III. 114.
Pitra (O. S. B., Cardinal), III. 713.
Pitroff, III. 554.
Pius II., Pope, II. 900.
Pius III., Pope, II. 914.
Pius IV., Pope, III. 360.
Pius V., Pope, III. 361.
Pius VI., Pope, III. 493. 650.
Pius VII., Pope, III. 652, 683.
Pius VIII., Pope, III. 693.
Pius IX., Pope, III. 782 sq., 791 sq.
Placidus, disciple of St. Benedict, II. 45.
Placidus, Prior of Nonantula, II. 531.
Planck, I. 56, III. 64, 1019.
Platina, II. 903.
Plato, I. 88, II. 743.
Platonism of the Fathers, I. 131 sq., 381.
Platonists, I. 88, II. 1003.
Plebeians to be likewise admitted into Cathedral Chapters, II. 642, note 2.
Plenary Councils of Baltimore, III. 941.
Plenaries, III. 1037.
Pletho, Themistius, II. 1004.
Plettenberg (Walter of), III. 171.
Pliny the Younger, I. 210 (note 5), 458.
Plock (See of), II. 249. III. 781.
Plotinus, I. 291.
Plutarch, I. 290.
Pneumatomachoi, I. 550.
Poeschl, III. 910.
Poetry, Christian, I. 694.
Poetry, popular, in the M. A., II. 786.
Poland (conversion of), II. 247, 800; synods and synodal statutes in Poland, II. 578 (note 1), III. 167; attempts of the Protestants to drag her into their sect, III. 164 sq.; partition of Poland, III. 561, 562.

Hosted by Google

Pole, Cardinal, III. 200, 207.
Polemics of the Pagans, I. 287, 489.
Polenz (John of), Bp. of Samland, III. 156.
Polycarp (St.), Bp. of Smyrna, I. 227, 267, 405, 445.
Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus, I. 248, 445.
Polyglot (Bibles), the Complutensian, II. 1009; the Antwerp and Paris, III. 417.
Polynesia, II. 963.
Polytheism, I. 67.
Pombal, III. 563.
Pomerania, II. 249, 800.
Pomesania (See of), 805.
Pomponazzo (Peter), II. 1004.
Pontanus, III. 383.
Ponticus, I. 267.
"Pontifex Maximus," a title, still retained by Christian Emperors, I. 469; but is put aside by Gratian, I. 485.
Poor-houses. II. 641.
Pope, title reserved for the Bishop of Rome, I. 674.
Pope; elections of Popes: regulations of Nicholas II. on this head, II. 326; of Alexander III., II. 568; of Gregory X., III. 606; of Gregory XV., III. 366; last instance of a papal election being ratified by the secular power, II. 484.
Popes; they always persevere in the true faith, I. 669, note 1 on p. 670; the coronation of the Popes, II. 344; first instance of this ceremony, II. 275; the Popes fall into a disgraceful dependence upon the Marquis of Tuscany, II. 292; they convoke councils and confirm their acts, II. 633; they give absolution from certain grievous crimes, II. 633; and grant all manner of dispensations, II. 633; the Pope is the center of Catholic unity, I. 203; and has the primacy of honor and jurisdiction, I. 205, 355, 409, 422, 581, 588, 667, 668 sq., II. 138 sq., 343, 406, 452, 464, 585, 630; is the Pope superior or inferior to the council, II. 863 sq.; his relation to the German Christian Emperor. II. 149, 185, 287, 305 sq., 340; Gemini principes, duo luminaria, et duo gladii, I. 649, II. 478, 489, 591; the Pope's position after the Reformation, III. 369, 471 sq.; chronological table of the Popes, I. 767, II. 1069, III. 1032; the Popes preside over councils, I. 524 (note), 595, 608, 668, 680; the Pope alone can depose a bishop, I. 670.
Popular religious chants, I. 210, 439, 696, II. 1032.
Popular traditions, I. 26.
Popular philosophy, III. 595, 601.
Porch or vestibule of a church, I. 689.
Porphyrius, pupil of Plotinus, I. 278, 292, II. 743.
Portiuncula, II. 717.
Port-Royal (Abbey of), III. 502 sq.
Portugal (recent religious events of), III. 722 sq., 830.
Posen (the most ancient See of Poland), II. 247; Jordan, first bishop, II. 247.
Possevin, Jesuit, III. 183, 393, 416.
Postulant, II. 44.
Pothinus (St.), Bp. of Lyons, I. 243, 267.
Potken (John), II. 1010.
Pott (John Henry), III. 588.
Powder-conspiracy, III. 216.
Powondra, III. 895.
Pradt (Abbé de), III. 672.
Praedicatores, II. 710.
Praefatio, I. 716.
Pragmatic sanction, II. 602.
Pragmatic sanction of Bourges, II. 896, 921, 925, III. 270.
Prague (See of), II. 245.
Praxeas, I. 352.
Prayer, seven times a day, I. 701, II. 44.
Praylus, Bp. of Jerusalem, I. 582.
Preaching, I. 712, II. 1033; by the bishop, I. 662.
Prechtl (Abbot), III. 125 (note 1), 539 (note 2).
Precistae, II. 633.
Precious Blood (Congr. of the), III. 945.
Predestination, I. 589, II. 425, III. 48, 99, 151.
Premices. See *First Fruits.*
Premonstratensians (Order of), II. 693.
Presbyter (John), III. 806.
Presbyter poenitentiarius, I. 429, 731.
Presbyters, I. 199.
Presbyters subordinate to bishops, I. 199; they begin to preach before the bishop, first instance of the kind in the West, I. 662; writings on the dignity of the priesthood, I. 654.
Presbyterae, I. 203, note 3.
Prierias, III. 15.
Priesthood, universal, I. 198.
Priesthood, special, I. 197.
Priesthood and royalty, I. 649, II. 341.
Priests (ordination of), I. 196, 734.
Priestly, I. 61.

Hosted by Google

Primacy of the Bp. of Rome. See *Popes.*
Primasius of Adrumetum, II. 168.
Primitive revelation, I. 63, 100.
Princes (Concordat of), II. 892.
Prior, II. 44, 718.
Prisca translatio, I. 683.
Priscilla, I. 344.
Priscillian, I. 755.
Priscillianists, I. 756.
Private chapels of the nobles, II. 349.
Privileges granted by the Popes to churches and monasteries, II. 343.
Privilegium Fori, II. 641.
Probabilism, III. 417.
Proclus, Patr. of Constantinople, I. 493, 603.
Proclus, Neo-Platonist, I. 493.
Procopius, the Elder and the Younger, II. 970.
Procuratores. See *Administrators.*
Professio fidei Tridentina, III. 357.
Propaganda, III. 401 sq., 685.
Propagation of Christianity in Asia, I. 174, 184, 236, 499, II. 806, III. 403, 576, 923 sq.; in Africa, I. 239, 504, II. 808, III. 411, 584, 933 sq.; in America, II. 1062, III. 409, 579 sq., 936 sq.; in Australia, III. 962; in Europe, I. 187, 241, II. 21, 224, 1058 sq.; obstacles opposed to the propagation of Christianity, I. 257, 498, II. 124.
Proselytes of the Gate and of Justice, I. 120.
Prosper (St.), I. 586.
Proterius, Patr. of Alexandria, I. 612.
Protestantism, origin of the name, III. 73; spread of Protestantism outside of Germany and Switzerland, III. 156 sq.; character of Protestantism, III. 298; causes of its rapid spread, III. 291.
Protoctistoi, I. 622.
Protogenes, Bp. of Sardica, I. 523.
Provincial Councils, I. 407, II. 348; provisions for their regular holding, I. 681, II. 886, III. 355, 371.
Provincial of the Dominicans, II. 719.
Prudentius (hymns of), I. 695.
Prudentius, Bp. of Troyes, II. 428.
Prussia (Conversion of), II. 804; turns Protestant, III. 156; establishment of the Kingdom of Prussia, and the Pope's protestation against it, III. 485; recent conflict of Prussia with the Holy See, III. 765; evangelical union, III. 985.
Pseudo-Synod of the Oak, I. 559.
Psyche (myth of), I. 98.
Ptolemaïs, II. 610.
Ptolemy de Fiadonibus, I. 41.
Public confession, I. 427, 729.
Public Schools, II. 39, 171 sq.
Pulcheria, I. 607.
Purcell, Abp., III. 939, 943, 946; Very Rev. Edward, III. 949.
Puritans, III. 212.
Pusey, III. 735, 848 sq.
Pyrrhus of Constantinople, I. 638 sq.
Pythagoreans, I. 87.

Q.

Quadragesimal Fast, I. 442.
Quadratus, Bp. of Athens, and Apologist, I. 294.
Quadrivium, II. 172, 1000.
Quakers, III. 608.
Quarterly Amer. Cath. Rev., III. 946.
Quartodecimans, I. 446.
Quelen, Archbp. of Paris, III. 706.
Quensted, III. 588.
Quesnel, III. 536.
Quietism, III. 510 sq.
Quinisextum (Council), I. 644.

R.

Raab (See of), II. 251.
Rabanus Maurus, II. 414, 428, 434.
Rabulas, Bp. of Edessa, I. 603.
Racine (Bonaventure), I. 48.
Rainald of Dassel, II. 553.
Rakow (Catechism of), III. 335.
Rancé (Boutbillier de), III. 530.
Raphael of Urbino, II. 1052.
Raskolniks, III. 625.
Ratherius, Bp. of Verona, II. 374, note 1, 422.
Ratisbon (See of), II. 105, 116; Council of Ratisbon, II. 180; league of the Catholic Princes, III. 51; diet of, III. 113.
Ratramnus, Monk of Corvey, II. 428, 434.
Ratzeburg (See of), II. 245.
Rauscher, Cardinal, I. 52.
Rautenstrauck, III. 544.
Ravaillac (Francis), III. 282.
Ravenna, I. 241.
Ravignan, Jesuit, III. 714.
Raymond VI., Count of Toulouse, II. 666.
Raymond VII., Count of T., II. 983.
Raymond Lullus, II. 783, 807.
Raymond Martini, II. 1061.
Raymond of Pennaforte, II. 699, 784.
Raymond du Puy, II. 702.
Raymund of Sabunde, II. 990.
Raynaldus, Oderic, I. 45.

Hosted by Google

Reaction of the Protestants against the Rationalism of Bruno Baur, III. 974.
Readoption of fallen Christians, I. 425 sq.
Realism, Nominalism, and Conceptualism, II. 742 sq., 989.
Reccared, II. 26.
Recess, III. 84, 115.
Receveur, I. 48.
Recollects, III. 944.
Recommendation (letters of) of the Martyrs, I. 430.
Reconciliation of Sinners, I. 427, 730.
Redemptorists, III. 531, 944.
Reformed Church, III. 325; divisions breaking out in its bosom, III. 325 sq.
Regale (controversy on the), III. 482.
Reginald, Bp. of Spire, II. 373.
Regino of Prüm, I. 41, II. 343, 421.
Reginum. See *Ratisbon.*
Regula fidei, I. 377.
Reichenau, II. 104.
Reiffenstuel, III. 556.
Relations between Church and State in Germany, II. 125 sq.
Religio licita, I. 277.
Religion (idea of), I. 1.
Religion of the pagan Nations, I. 64 sq., II. 15, 237.
Religion, edict concerning religion in Prussia, III. 965.
Religion of force, II. 406.
Religious Conference of Marburg, III. 74.
Religious Conferences of Ratisbon, III. 113, 126.
Religious Conference of Thorn, III. 445.
Religious Conference of Worms, III. 442.
Religious Conferences of Baden and Emmendingen, III. 443.
Religious differences settled by the peace of Augsburg, III. 136, and Nürnberg, III. 86.
Relics (veneration of) among Catholics, I. 302, 703, 760, II. 404, III. 355; among Protestants, III. 133.
Rembert, II. 228.
Remigius (St.), Archbp. of Rheims, II. 47, 396.
Remigius of Lyons, II. 428.
Remismond, II. 25.
Remonstrants, III. 326.
Reparatus, Bp. of Carthage, I. 625.
Reservatum ecclesiasticum, III. 140.
Residence, duty of, in monks, II. 44.
Responsories, I. 696.
Restitution (edict of), III.452.
Resurrection of Christ, I. 161.
Reuchlin, II. 1009.
Reval (See of), II. 803.
Revelation, primitive, I. 64 sq., 100.
Revolution, French, III. 629 sq.
Rheims (School of), II. 369, 423.
Rheims Seminary for Catholic Englishmen, III. 214.
Rheims, Councils of, II. 168, 340, 657, 693, 753.
Rhense (Electoral Assembly of), II. 836.
Rhinocorura (Theological School of), I. 653.
Ribera, de, III. 537.
Ricci (Lawrence), III. 571.
Ricci (Matthew), III. 406.
Ricci (Scipio), Bp. of Pistoja, III. 536 sq.
Richard of Cornwallis, II. 598.
Richard Coeur de Lion, II. 572.
Richard Simon, III. 521.
Richard of St. Victor, II. 761, 764.
Richelieu, III. 282, 455.
Richer, III. 369.
Riculph, Archbp. of Mentz, II. 272.
Rienzi (Cola de'), II. 840.
Riffel (works of), I. 463, III. 3, 101; he is deposed, III. 777.
Riga, II. 803.
Right of the Stronger, II. 406.
Rigorism of some Christians, I. 429, II. 410, 1057.
Rimini (Council of), I. 542.
Ring and Crosier, I. 694, II. 340.
Ritter (J. J.), I. 53.
Robber-Synod. See *Ephesus.*
Robbia (Luke della). See *Luke.*
Robert of Arbrissel, II. 695.
Robert Molesme, Abbot of Citeaux, II. 683.
Robert Fludd, III. 315.
Robert Guiscard, II. 322, 327.
Robert, Bp. of Liège, II. 1029.
Robert Pulleyne, II. 754, 766.
Robespierre, III. 642 sq.
Roderic, II. 111.
Rodriguez, III. 375, 424.
Rogationum dies, I. 700.
Roger Bacon, II. 782, 785.
Roger of Béziers, II. 666.
Rohrbacher, I. 48, III. 713.
Röhr, III. 968.
Rolfus, III. 896.
Romans (religion and morals of the), I. 92.
Romanus, Monk, II. 42.
Rome; her importance as the See of the Head of the Church, I. 410 sq.;

Hosted by Google

Councils of Rome, I. 534, 563, 595, II. 210, 303, 319, 321, 326 sq., 444 sq., 485, 487.
Rome-Scot, II. 379.
Romuald (Congr. of St.), II. 363.
Rongé, III. 913.
Rosary (Confraternity of the), II. 1033.
Rosary (Feast of the), II. 1033.
Rosary mode of prayer, II. 398, 1033.
Roscelin, II. 745.
Rosecruciani, III. 314.
Röskild (See of), II. 229.
Rosmini-Serbati, III. 696, note 1.
Rossi, Minister, III. 785.
Rossi (Bernard), III. 535.
Rossi, Cavaliere de', I. 438, note, III. 801.
Rottmann (Bernard), III. 116.
Rousseau (J. B.), III. 897.
Rousseau (J. J.), III. 528.
Royko, I. 51.
Rudolph (Agricola), II. 1006.
Rudolph of Hapsburg, II. 607.
Rudolph of Suabia, II. 503, 506.
Rue (de la), I. 46, III. 520.
Rufinus, Priest of Aquileja, I. 37, 555.
Rufinus, Priest of Syria, I. 573.
Rügen (Conversion of the island of), II. 802.
Rule of Faith. See *Regula Fidei.*
Rule of St. Benedict, II. 43.
Rupert of Deutz, II. 763.
Rupert, Bp. of Worms, II. 106.
Rupp, III. 974.
Rural Bishops. See *Chorepiscopi.*
Rural Chapters, II. 352.
Russia (Conversion of), II. 470.
Russia; the Catholic Church in Russia, III. 779, 918.
Russian; Graeco-Russian Church, III. 461 sq., 622 sq., 920.
Rusticus, Roman Deacon, I. 624.
Ruttenstock, I. 53.
Ruysbroch (John), II. 996.

S.

Sabas (St.), Abbot, I. 752.
Sabbath, I. 212.
Sabeans or Homerites. See that name.
Sabellius, I. 353 sq.
Saccarelli, I. 49.
Sacramentarians (discussion of the), III. 102 sq.
Sacred Heart (Ladies of the), III. 836.
Sacrament (Feast of the Blessed), II. 1029.
Sacrifices, private forbidden), I. 470; bloody interdicted, I. 470; pagan officials instructed not to participate in public, I. 471.
Sacrifices all forbidden, I. 471.
Sacrilege (law against), III. 703.
Sacy (Le maistre de), III. 521.
Sadduceans, I. 121.
Sadolet, III. 419.
Sagittarius, I. 54.
Sahag, Patr. of the Armenians, I. 501.
Sailer, III. 887, 891.
Sainte-Foi, III. 714.
Saint-Martin, III. 659.
Saints; All Saints' Day, I. 704, II. 397.
Saints (ἅγιοι), name of the Christians, I. 207.
Saints; earliest object of the *true* veneration of the, I. 302, II. 215.
Saisette (Bernard), Bp. of Pamiers, II. 620.
Salary of the Clergy by the State, II. 650.
Salmeron (Alphonse), III. 421.
Salpetrians, III. 911.
Salvianus, I. 488, 498, II. 28.
Salzburg, II. 105, 116; Protestant emigration from Salzburg, III. 619.
Samaritans, I. 120.
Sambuga, III. 887.
Samland (See of), II. 805.
Samosatenians, I. 350.
Samson (Bernard), III. 91.
Samuel of Worms, II. 173.
Santarel, III. 369.
Sarabaites, I. 753.
Saragossa (Council of), I. 756.
Sardica (Council of), I. 536.
Sarpi (Paolo), I. 49, III. 340, 365, 369.
Sartorius, III. 985.
Saturday (fast of), I. 442.
Saturday consecrated to the B. V., II. 399.
Saturninus the Gnostic, I. 325.
Saul, persecutor of the Christians, I 171.
Saul, monastery of, II. 55.
Savonarola, II. 912, 1036.
Saxons (Conversion of the), II. 120.
Scandinavia, II. 18.
Scapular (Confraternity of the), II. 695.
Schaff (Dr.), I. 57, III. 1002.
Schaffner (M.) II. 1055.
Schall (Adam), III. 407.
Scheibel, III. 985.
Schelling, III. 970.
Schenkel, III. 981, 983.
Schiller, III. 605.
Schism (definition of), I. 5.
Schism, Greek, II. 463.
Schism, Western, I. 630, II. 845 sq.
Schlegel (Frederic von), III. 755.

Hosted by Google

Schleiermacher, I. 60, III. 970, 984.
Schmalfuss, I. 51.
Schmalkalden (Articles of), III. 111.
Schmalkalden (League of), III. 85, 111.
Schmalkalden (War of), III. 134 sq.
Schmalzgrueber, III. 556.
Schmid (Christian), I. 56 or 59.
Schmidt (J. A.) I. 54.,
Schmitt (H. J.), III. 461.
Schnepf, III. 87.
Schoen (Martin), II. 1055.
Schola Palatina, II. 172.
Scholastica (St.), II. 45.
Scholasticism, II. 733, 746, 765, 988, 1064.
Scholz, III. 892.
Schools, divergent theological, I. 373, 563.
Schools established by Bishops, II. 173, 412.
School of Classics, interdicted to the Christians by Julian, I. 479.
Schools (Brothers and Sisters of the Christian), III. 396, 661, 945.
Schoolmen, II. 973.
Schröckh, I. 55.
Schwabach or Torgau, articles of, III, 74.
Schwarz. Ildephonse, III. 887.
Schwarzel, III. 554, 895.
Schwarzhuber, III. 887.
Schwegler, III. 981.
Schwenkfeld, III. 332.
Sciarra Colonna, II. 627.
Science, principles of theological, I. 370.
Science, divergent forms of it, I. 373. II. 732 sq.
Scillitan (Martyrs), I. 269.
Scotists, II. 780.
Scotland (conversion of), II. 58; she passes over to Protestantism, III. 228; Catholic elements in Scotland, III. 735; restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in Scotland, III. 863.
Seasons (Holy), I. 211, 442.
Seclucianus, III. 158, 165.
Sects, idea of, I. 4.
Sects, fanatical and refractory, II. 653.
Secularization, first practised in the peace of Westphalia, III. 456.
Secularization of the States of the Church, III. 666, 789.
Secularization of the ecclesiastical principalities in Germany, III. 676.
Secundus of Tigisis, I. 513.
Sedulius, author of hymns, I. 695, II. 386.
Segarelli, Gerard, II. 675.
Segneri, III. 423.
Seguier, III. 529.
Self-flagellation, II. 410, 1057.
Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Metropolis, I. 604.
Seleucia (Council of), I. 542.
Seleucia (See of), I. 499.
Seleucia, the residence of a Nestorian bishop, I. 604.
Seelburg (See of), II. 803.
Sees of Bishops, I. 384.
Seligenstadt (See of), II, vide *Halberstadt.*
Selon (See of), II. 803.
Selvaggio, I. 49, III. 535.
Semgallen, II. 803.
Semi-Arians, I. 539.
Seminaries, clerical, I. 653, III. 354, 372, 680, 946.
Seminary (Mt. St. Mary's of the West), III. 946.
Semi-Pelagians, I. 580.
Semler, I. 55, III. 599.
Seneca, I. 97.
Separation of the Church from the Synagogue, I. 190.
Separation of Church and State, III. 478.
Septuagint (Version), I. 117, III. 421.
Sepulture, Christian, I. 453, 739.
Serapeion (destruction of the), I. 486.
Sergius I., Pope, I. 631.
Sergius II., Pope, II. 264.
Sergius III., Pope, II. 293.
Sergius, Patr. of Constantinople, I. 633.
Sergius (Paul), I. 174.
Sermon, I. 712.
Servatus Lupus, II. 436.
Servede (Michael), III. 148.
Servians, II. 239.
Servites, II. 723.
Servus Servorum Dei, I. 675.
Sethites, I. 319.
Severians (Monophysites), I. 615.
Severians, partisans of Tatian, I. 328.
Severin (St.), II. 105.
Severus of Antioch, I. 615.
Severus, Monk, I. 614.
Shaftesbury, III. 525.
Shapur, II. 499.
Sibylline (oracles), I. 255.
Sicilian (Vespers), II. 608.
Sicily conquered by the Normans and received as a fief from the Holy See, II. 322, 516.
Sickingen (Francis of), III. 31.
Sidney, III. 963.
Sidonius Apollinaris (St.), Bp. of Clermont, II. 25.
Sieciechow (abbey of), II. 248.

Hosted by Google

Siena (Council of), II. 873.
Sieyes, III. 633.
Sigismund (St.), King of the Burgundians, II. 30.
Sigismund, Emperor, II. 860.
Sigismund I., King of Poland, III. 164.
Sigismund, Augustus II., III. 166.
Sigismund III., King of Poland and Sweden, III. 168.
Signaculum sinus, manuum et oris, I. 341.
Sigonius (Aurelius), I. 49.
Siguier, III. 713.
Silesia (Conversion of), II. 248.
Silesia passes over to Protestantism, III. 160.
Simeon (St.), Bp. of Jerusalem, I. 264.
Simeon Metaphrastes, II. 467.
Simeon, Bp. of Seleucia, I. 499.
Simeon (St.) the Stylite, I. 601, 734, 754.
Simon the Magician, I. 171, 220.
Simon of Montfort, II. 666.
Simon Stock, II. 695.
Simony, I. 220, II. 159, 487.
Simony, laws passed against, II. 327, 368, 511.
Simplicius, Neo-Platonist, I. 493.
Sin, original. See *Original sin.* Sins, absolution from which was denied even to the dying, I. 428 sq.; detailed confession of sins, I. 209, 425, 727, II. 796.
Singing-schools, I. 696, II. 403.
Siricius, I. 671, 757.
Sirmium (Councils of), I. 540, 561.
Sirmian formularies of faith, I. 541.
Sirmond, I. 46.
Sisters of the Free Spirit, II. 674.
Sixtus IV., Pope, II. 903.
Sixtus V., Pope, III. 362.
Skalholt (See of), II. 235.
Skara (See of), II. 230.
Skarga (Peter), III. 170, 423.
Skepticism, I. 95, 287, II. 611.
Skepticism, historical, III. 523.
Skepticism of the Neo-Peripatetics, II. 1004.
Slavery, I. 69; greatly mitigated, and finally abolished, by Christianity, I. 457, 466, 703, II. 643
Slaves, II. 236 sq.
Sleepers, the Seven, I. 275.
Societies for the propagation of good books, III. 700, 759, 896.
Socinians, III. 335.
Socinus (Faustus), III. 334; (Lelius), III. 334.
Socrates, Church Historian, I. 36.
Soissons (Council of), II. 117, 281, 746, 749.
Somasces, III. 388, 395.
Sommier, French theologian, III. 518.
Son of God, doctrine of the Church on Christ as the, I. 364, 519 sq.
Sophronius, Monk and Patriarch of Jerusalem, I. 634.
Sorbonne, II. 848, III. 429.
Sorcery, II. 1015, III. 300.
Sorores de Militia Christi, II. 711.
Souls, All-Souls' day, II. 397.
South America, III. 959.
Sozomenus, Hermias, I. 38.
Spain, propagation of Christianity in, I. 242, II. 25; latest events there, III. 715, 831.
Spalding, M. J., his works, III. 942.
Spee (Frederic von-der), II. 984, III. 434, 441, 588.
Spener, III. 589.
Spire (See of), II. 108.
Spire (Diet of), III. 73.
Spinola (Christian Rojas), III. 539.
Spinoza, III. 594.
Spirituales, II. 723, 1020.
Spittler, I. 56.
Spondanus of Pamiers, I. 45.
Sponsores (fideijussores), I. 418.
Sprenger, II. 1015.
Squarcione Giacomo, II. 1054.
Stanislaus (St.), Bp. of Cracow, II. 250.
Stäudlin, I. 56.
Stattler (Benedict), III. 552.
Staudenmaier, III. 889.
Staupitz, III. 10.
Stavanger (See of), II. 233.
Stephen I., Pope, I. 422, 424.
Stephen (II.) III., Pope, II. 143.
Stephen (III.) IV., Pope, II. 145, note.
Stephen (IV.) V., Pope, II. 255.
Stephen (V.) VI., Pope, II. 289.
Stephen (VI.) VII., Pope, II. 291.
Stephen (VII.) VIII., Pope, II. 296.
Stephen (VIII.) IX., Pope, II. 296.
Stephen (IX.), X., Pope, II. 324.
Stephen (St.), Protomartyr, I. 170, 703.
Stephen (St.), King of Hungary, II. 251.
Stephen, Bp. of Dora, I. 637.
Stephen (St.) Harding, II. 684, note 1.
Stephen of Lisiac, II. 689.
Stephen Niobes, I. 610.
Stephen of Tigerno, II. 688.
Stercoranism, II. 433.
Stewards. See *Administrators.*
Stigmatum, festum, II. 718.
Stoics, I. 90, 287.
Stole, I. 693.

Hosted by Google

Stolberg (Frederic Leopold), I. 51, III. 679, 864.
Stolz (Alban), III. 896.
Storch (Nicholas), III. 53.
Strasburg (See of), II. 108.
Strauss, III. 972, 982, 983.
Strengnäs (See of), II. 231.
Strigel (Victorin), III. 317.
Sturleson (Snorre), II. 235, 1065.
Sturm (Abbot), II. 117.
Stylites, I. 754.
Suabia (Mirror of), II. 549.
Suarez, Jesuit, III. 416.
Subiaco, II. 42.
Substance, I. 366.
Suevi, II. 22.
Suidas, II. 467.
Suidbert, II. 110.
Sulpicians, III. 942, 948.
Sulpitius Severus, I. 38.
Sunday, I. 441; the Manichaeans fast on Sundays, I. 340; the Catholics do not, I. 441.
Sunnia, II. 23.
Superattendents or Superintendents, III. 70, 303.
Superpositio jejunii, I. 442.
Superstition, II. 1014; among Protestants, III. 303, 588.
Support of the clergy. See *Tithes.*
Supralapsarians, III. 326.
Supremacy (oath of), III. 195, 209.
Surius, III. 423.
Suso (Henry), II. 995.
Sutri (Council of), II. 318.
Sweden; her conversion to Christianity, II. 230; she turns Protestant, III. 176; intolerant down to the present day, III. 994.
Swedenborg (Emmanuel), III. 614.
Swerker, King of Sweden, II. 230.
Switzerland (Conversion of), II. 98.
Switzerland; her religious situation at the present day, III. 744, 882.
Sylvester I., Pope, I. 523, 675.
Sylvester II., Pope, II. 252, 314, 519.
Symbol of the Apostles, I. 230 (note *), 363; is enlarged in proportion to the new heresies arising, I. 506 sq.
Symbol of Nice, I. 524, note.
Symbol of St. Athanasius, I. 552.
Symbol, the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan, I. 551, note 1.
Symbol of Ephesus, I. 601, note *.
Symbol of Chalcedon, I. 609, note *.
Symbol of the IIId Council of Constantinople, I. 641, note 1.
Symbolic books, III. 299.
Symbolism considered as a science, III. 1019 sq.
Symeon. See *Simeon.*
Symmachus, Consular dignitarian, II. 34.
Symmachus, Pope, I. 614.
Symmachus, Prefect, I. 491.
Syncellus, I. 651.
Syncretism (signification of the word), III. 323, note.
Syncretic Controversy, III. 323.
Synergistic Controversy, III. 317.
Synesius, I. 655, 695.
Synnada (Council of), I. 421.
Synod, the holy permanent, of Russia, III. 624.
Synodal courts, II. 351.
Σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, I. 622, 664.
Synods, provincial, held in abeyance, II. 348, 351.
Syrianus, Neo-Platonist, I. 492.
System, feudal, II. 132, 339.

T.

Tabernacles, II. 1027.
Taborites, II. 970.
Talleyrand, III. 634.
Tamburini, III. 536.
Tanchelm, II. 654.
Tancred of Lecce, II. 573.
Tanner (Adam), II. 984.
Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, II. 214.
Tasso (Torquato), III. 433.
Tatars or Tartars, II. 468.
Tatian, Apologist first, I. 294; then Gnostic, I. 328.
Tauler (John), II. 994, 1035.
Telemachus, Monk, I. 741.
Temperance Societies, III. 738.
Templars, Knights, II. 703; their suppression, II. 827, 828.
Territorial (System), III. 304, 585.
Tertius Ordo de poenitentia, or Tertiaries, II. 716.
Tertullian, I. 269, 296, 345, 360, 384, 401, 456.
Test-oath, III. 225.
Tetzel, III. 12 sq.
Teutonic (Knights), II. 705, 1058.
Thaddeus, Apostle, I. 184.
Thangbrand, II. 232.
Theatines, III. 387.
Thebaean legion, I. 281.
Thebutis, chief of the Ebionites, I. 217.
Theganus, II. 417.
Themistius and his partisans, I. 492, 616.
Themistius, Neo-Platonist, I. 492.
Theodatus, King of the Ostrogoths, II. 34.

Hosted by Google

Theodora, Empress, I. 618.
Theodore Askidas, I. 621; Bp. of Caesarea. I. 625.
Theodore, Archbp. of Canterbury, II. 82.
Theodore Cassiteras. II. 216.
Theodore, Lector of Constantinople, I. 37.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, I. 594, 598, 603. 622.
Theodore, Bp. of Pharan, I. 633.
Theodore Studita, II. 217.
Theodoret. Bp. of Cyrus, I. 36, 495, 598, 603, 618, 622.
Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, II. 33, 47.
Theodosius I., the Great, I. 485, 730.
Theodosius II., the Younger, I. 487, 607.
Theodosius, Capuchin, III. 884.
Theodotus, the Elder, the Tanner, I. 349.
Theodotus, the Younger, the Money-changer, I. 350.
Theodulph, Bp. of Orleans, II. 173.
Theological (tendencies), I. 370, 564, II. 745 sq., 780.
Theologumena. I. 5.
Theophilantropists, III. 649.
Theophilus of Alexandria, I. 486.
Theophilus of Antioch, Apologist, I. 295.
Theophylactus, Archbp. of Achrida, II. 465.
Theophylactus, Archbp. of Bulgaria, II. 466.
Θεοτόκος, I. 593.
Teresa (St.), III. 392.
Therapeutai, I. 119.
Thevin (Council of), I. 632.
Thiersch, III. 975, 1006.
Thirty years' war, III. 447 sq.
Tholuk, III. 977.
Thomas, Apostle, I. 184.
Thomas Aquinas, II. 604, 769.
Thomas Barsumas, I. 603.
Thomas à Becket, II. 563 sq.
Thomas of Celano (author of "*Dies irae*"), II. 1032.
Thomas de Vio of Gaëta. See *Cajetan.*
Thomas à Kempis, II. 998, 1026.
Thomas Waldensis, II. 952.
Thomas, Christians of St. Thomas, I. 604.
Thomasius, III. 519, 991.
Thomassini, I. 46.
Thomists, II. 780.
Thorn (Conference of), III. 171, 445.
Thrasamund, II. 29.
Thurificati, I. 274, 430.
Thurles, (National Synod of), III. 859.
Thyestian (banquets), I. 260, 437.
Thym, I. 60.
Tiara, I. 693.
Tiberius, Emperor, I. 145, 189.
Tillemont, I. 47.
Tilly, III. 451.
Timothy, I. 176, 187.
Tipasa (Martyrs of), I. 28.
Tiraboschi, III. 535.
Tiridates, King of Armenia, I. 501.
Tirini, Interpreter, III. 421.
Tithes, I. 397. 658, II. 130, 355.
Tithes of Saladin, II. 571.
Titian, II. 1054, III. 433.
Titular Bishops (*in partibus, infidelium*), II. 648.
Titus, Roman General, I. 192.
Titus, disciple of St. Paul's, I. 187.
Toland, III. 525.
Toledo (Councils of), I. 553, 730, II. 26.
Toleration, Edict of Joseph, III. 620.
Toleto (Francis), III. 417.
Tolosa (Council of), II. 391.
Tongres (See of), II. 108.
Tonsure, I. 694; controversy on the tonsure, II. 88.
Torgau, league of Protestant princes made at T., III. 52.
Tostatus (Alphonse), II. 1008.
Toul (See of), II. 108.
Toulouse (Council of), II. 391, 981, 1026.
Tournay (See of), II. 108.
Tournely, III. 519.
Tours (Councils of), II. 161, 445.
Tours (School of), II. 369.
Tradition, pharasaical, I. 121.
Tradition of the Catholic Church, I. 358 sq.
Traditores, I. 280, 513.
Traducianism, I. 562.
Trajan, I. 263.
Translation of Bishops reserved to the Pope, II. 633.
Translations of the Holy Scriptures, I. 108, II. 22, 1011, III. 43, 93, 165, 422, 535.
Transubstantiation, I. 435, 713, II. 439 sq., 442 sq.
Transubstantiation, when this word was used for the first time, II. 584; although the dogma existed at all times, I. 433. 713.
Transylvania, III. 174.
Trappists, III. 530; in America, III. 944.
Trautson, Archbp. of Vienna, III. 550.

Hosted by Google

Treaty of the 15th of Sept. 1864 (violation of the), III. 789.
Trent (See of), II. 105.
Trent (Council of), negotiations on it, III. 124; celebration of the Council, III. 340 sq., acquiescence in its decrees, III. 359 sq.
Treuga Dei. See *Truce of God.*
Treves (See of). II. 108.
Tribonianus, Jurisconsult, I. 617.
Tribur (German Council of), II. 370.
Tribur (Assembly of), II. 499.
Trichotomy,(Platonian), of man, I. 562.
Trimurti of the Hindoos, I. 76.
Trinitarians (Order of). II. 698.
Trinitas and Τρίας terms employed for the first time, I. 369; scientific development of this dogma, I. 368 sq.; distortion to Tritheism, II. 745; denial of this mystery by the Antitrinitarians, I. 348, III. 334; by the Socinians, III. 335; modern Rationalists, III. 595.
Trinity (Religious Order of the). See *Trinitarians.*
Trinitatis festum, II. 1031.
Trinoda necessitas, II. 378.
Tritenheim (John), I. 42.
Tritheism, I. 616, II. 745.
Triumphus, Augustinus. See *Augustine.*
Trivium, II. 172, 1000.
Trosly (Council of), II. 361.
Troubadours, II. 669, 788.
Truce of God, II. 368, 407.
Trullan Synod, I. 640, 644.
Trullan Synod (Observation), I. 644.
Turketul, II. 381.
Turrecremata. See *John.*
Turretin, I. 60.
Tursellin, III. 383, 423.
Τύπος. Edict of faith, I. 638.
Twesten, III. 971.
Tyniec (Abbey of), II. 248.
Tyrannicide, doctrine of, III. 301, 369.
Tyre (Pseudo-synod of), I. 531.

U.

Uchansky, Archbp. of Gnesen, III. 168.
Uhlich, III. 974.
Ulenberg, III. 3, 422.
Ulfila, II. 22.
Ulric (St.), Bp. of Augsburg, II. 371, 397.
Unigenitus, Bull, III. 505.
Union; tentatives of union between Protestants and Catholics, III.539 sq.
Union, hypostatic, of the two natures in J. Christ, I. 365, 590, 601.
Unitarians, III. 334.
United States of North America. III. 939 sq., 1001 sq.
Unity of the Church, I. 405 sq, 411.
Unity of Faith, I. 213, 361.
Universal (Bishop), I. 675.
Universities, II. 729, 1064.
Unni, Archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, II. 228.
Unwan, Archbishop of Bremen, II. 373.
Ὑπόστασις, I. 366.
Upper Rhine, Eccl. Prov. of the, III. 771 sq., 870 sq.
Upsala (See of), Metropolis of Sweden, II. 231.
Upsala (Discussion of), III. 177.
Urban II., Pope, II. 511, 515.
Urban IV., Pope, II. 599, 1029.
Urban V., Pope, II. 841, 1023.
Urban VI., Pope, II. 846, 1030, 1059.
Urban VII., Pope, III. 364.
Urban VIII., Pope, III. 367.
Ursacius of Singidunum, I. 537, 541.
Ursula (St.) and her companions, I. 271, note 3.
Ursulines, III. 394.
Usher, I. 59.
Utrecht, Metropolis, II. 110.
Utrecht (Jansenist Schism of), III. 508, 741.

V.

Vairesse, III. 526.
Valdez (Alphonse), III. 41.
Valence (Councils of), I. 588, II. 338, 430.
Valens, Emperor, I. 484, 545.
Valens of Mursia, in Pannonia, I. 537.
Valentine, the Gnostic, I. 319.
Valentine, the Missionary, II. 105.
Valentinian I., I. 484.
Valentinian II., I. 484, 545.
Valentinian III., I. 488, 676.
Vallarsi, III. 535.
Vallombrosa (Order of), II. 364, 377.
Vandals, II. 26.
Vannes (Congr. of St.), III. 391.
Varlet (Dominic), III. 509.
Vasquez, III. 417, 428.
Vega (Lope de), III. 433.
Veith (Emmanuel), III. 889.
Venema (Herman), I. 60.
Veneration of the Saints, I. 302, II. 207 sq.
Venice (peace of), II. 562.
Vercelli (Council of, II. 444.

Hosted by Google

Verden (See of), II. 123.
Verdun (See of), II. 108.
Verdun (treaty of), II. 263.
Vergerius, the Pope's Nuncio, III. 110.
Vernulaeus, III. 383.
Verona (Council of), II. 980.
Veronius, III. 444.
Vespasian, Emperor, I. 192.
Vespasiani, Bp. of Fano, I 693, note.
Vestibule of a church, I. 689.
Viborg (See of), II. 230.
Vicars of the Pope, II. 343.
Vicars General, II. 647.
Victor I., Pope, I. 349. 352, 445.
Victor II., Pope, II. 323.
Victor III., Pope, II. 511.
Victor IV., Pope. II. 554.
Victorinus, Bp. of Petavio. I. 251.
Victorinus (hymns of), I. 695.
Vienne (Council of), II. 823. Conf. I. 243.
Viger, Jesuit, III. 383.
Vigil. I. 447.
Vigilantius, I. 760.
Vigilius, Pope, I. 624.
Vigor, III. 423.
Villani (Giovanni), II. 816, 1002.
Vilmar, III. 965, 987.
Vincent of Beauvais, I. 42, II. 730, 783.
Vincent (St.), Bp. of Capua, I. 543.
Vincent (St.) Ferrer, II. 849, 1035, 1057.
Vincent of Lerins, I. 510. 587.
Vincent (St.) of Paul, III. 398 sq.
Vinci (Leonardo dà), II. 1051.
Vindonissa (See of), II. 99.
Vineis (Peter *de*). See *Peter.*
Viret (Peter). III. 146.
Virgilius, Bp. of Salzburg, II. 240 385.
Virginity, I. 208, 398 sq.
Vischer, II. 1049.
Visigoths, II. 24.
Visitation (Feast of the) of the B. V., II. 1030.
Visitation (Order of the), III. 393.
Visitation of diocese and Visitors, I. 662, II. 137.
Visitation parochial, II. 137.
Vitalian, Pope, II. 82.
Viterbo (Giles of), II. 918, 1018.
Vivès (Louis and Erasmus), II. 1007, III. 417.
Voit, III. 519.
Voltaire, II. 265, III. 527, 570.
Voss. I. 59.
Votive Masses, I. 720.
Vulfilach, deacon, stylite, I. 754.
Vulgate, amended, III. 363.
Vulgate, new amendment, with the aid of the Hebrew and Greek texts, II. 785 sq., III. 363.

W.

Wadstena (Convent of), II. 1024, III. 186.
Wafers, or unleavened altar-bread, I. 722, II. 401.
Walafried Strabo, II. 222, 415.
Walbodo (St.), Bp. of Liége. II. 373.
Walch. Father and Son, I. 55.
Waldenses, II. 658 sq., 708.
Waldrada, II. 279.
Wallia, King of the Visigoths, II. 25.
Walter, or Gauthier of St. Victor, II. 761.
Walter von der Vogelweide. II. 787.
Walter (writer on C. L.), III. 894.
Waltram, Bp. of Naumburg, II. 502, note.
Ward, Mary (Visitation-nun, III. 395.
Warsaw (Peace of Religion), III. 168.
Warszewicki, Jesuit, III. 181.
Wazon, Bp. of Liége, II. 374, 422.
Wednesday (fast-day), I. 441, II. 16.
Wegscheider, III. 986.
Weigel (Valentin), III. 313.
Weigelians, III. 313.
Weigl, II. 999, note.
Weishaupt, III. 557.
Weislinger, II. 1010, note, III. 541, 619.
Weismann, Ch. Hist., I. 55.
Wenceslaus, II. 244.
Wends, II. 245.
Weninger, S. J., III. 939.
Wertheim (Bible), III. 596.
Wesel (John), II. 973.
Wesley (John and Charles), III. 610.
Wesprim (See of), II. 251.
Wessel (John), II. 975.
Wessenberg, III. 911.
Westphalia (Peace of), III. 456.
Westeräs (See of), II. 231; diet of, III. 179.
Wexiö (See of), II. 231.
Wicelius (George), III. 443.
Wicliffe, II. 947.
Wieland, III. 605.
Wigand. III. 320.
Wilfrid, II. 84.
William II., King of Sicily, II. 549.
William Allen, III. 214.
William of Auvergne, II. 767.
William of Champeaux, II. 685, 747.
William Durandus, II. 826.
William Nogaret. See *Nogaret.*
William of St. Amour, II. 721.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google